READER,

THE great Work of them who are *Embaſſadors for Chriſt, to beſeech men in his ſtead, to be reconciled unto God*, is to reveal the Will and Love of the Father, in making *him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*. The manifeſtation of the Excellency, Fulneſs, Sufficiency, and abſolute preheminence of that *Righteouſneſs*, ſo wrought out, from the Councel of the Will of God, diſpenſed in a Covenant of Grace, is that, which in the purſuit, and diſcharge of the Truſt committed to them, they cheifly, through the ſtrength of God, do, or ought to lift up themſelves unto. In this Labor of the Goſpel, hath the Author of the enſuing *Treatiſe*, evinced his Fellowſhip and Communion, by the travel of his minde, (accompanied with thoſe advantages of Abilities, and Learning, which make ſuch undertakings acceptable, and uſeful) which he hath laid out therein. The perſons, occaſion, and other circumſtances, related unto, in this Diſcourſe, I am utterly unacquainted withal, but onely by the light which concerning them, *it ſelf* holds out unto me; which being not a ſufficient bottom for a Judgement of this notoriety, I am not called, no more then deſired to deliver my Thoughts concerning them. *Every mans work ſhall be made manifeſt, for the day ſhall declare it, becauſe it ſhall be revealed by fire, and the fire ſhall try every mans work, of what ſort it is*. Of the Matter treated on herein, various are the Thoughts of Learned Men; thoſe doubtleſs ſeem to have the advantage, who walk in a profeſſed compliance with the deſign of God, to give *the Son of his Love*, with his Love and Grace in him, *the preheminence in all things*. To deliver my Thoughts concerning the ſeverals, argued, and diſputed in this *Treatiſe*, neither the minute of time, whereunto for this expreſſion of my ſelf I am confined, will admit me, nor doth my preſent aim require: [Eſpecially conſidering that I have at large delivered my ſelf to the main Head of the whole, in my Book of the *Perſeverance of the Saints*, and Anſwer to Mr. *John Goodwin* on that ſubject, now almoſt cleared off the Preſs.] For the preſent, I ſhall only ſay, That there being too great evidence of very welcome entertainment, and acceptance, given by many to an almoſt pure *Socinian Juſtification*, and *Expoſition of the Covenant of Grace*, even amongſt them, into *whoſe hearts God* ſeems *to have ſhined*, in ſome meaſure, *to give the light of the knowledge of his glory, in the face of Jeſus Chriſt*, all ſolid, learned, ſober, endeavors, for the Vindication, of the abſoluteneſs freedom, independency, and preheminence of that Grace in Jeſus Chriſt, whereby we are ſaved, will doubtleſs finde acceptance with the Children of Goſpel-Wiſdom, and all that love the glory of him that bought us. Amongſt ſuch Labors and Endeavors (Chriſt an Reader) I commend to thy conſideration, the enſuing Treatiſe, and commit thee to the Lord.

Weſtminſter, Nov. 7. 1653. JOHN OWEN.

READER,

THE great Work of them who are *Embaſſadors for Chriſt, to beſeech men in his ſtead, to be reconciled unto God*, is to reveal the Will and Love of the Father, in making *him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*. The manifeſtation of the Excellency, Fulneſs, Sufficiency, and abſolute preheminence of that *Righteouſneſs*, ſo wrought out, from the Councel of the Will of God, diſpenſed in a Covenant of Grace, is that, which in the purſuit, and diſcharge of the Truſt committed to them, they cheifly, through the ſtrength of God, do, or ought to lift up themſelves unto. In this Labor of the Goſpel, hath the Author of the enſuing *Treatiſe*, evinced his Fellowſhip and Communion, by the travel of his minde, (accompanied with thoſe advantages of Abilities, and Learning, which make ſuch undertakings acceptable, and uſeful) which he hath laid out therein. The perſons, occaſion, and other circumſtances, related unto, in this Diſcourſe, I am utterly unacquainted withal, but onely by the light which concerning them, *it ſelf* holds out unto me; which being not a ſufficient bottom for a Judgement of this notoriety, I am not called, no more then deſired to deliver my Thoughts concerning them. *Every mans work ſhall be made manifeſt, for the day ſhall declare it, becauſe it ſhall be revealed by fire, and the fire ſhall try every mans work, of what ſort it is*. Of the Matter treated on herein, various are the Thoughts of Learned Men; thoſe doubtleſs ſeem to have the advantage, who walk in a profeſſed compliance with the deſign of God, to give *the Son of his Love*, with his Love and Grace in him, *the preheminence in all things*. To deliver my Thoughts concerning the ſeverals, argued, and diſputed in this *Treatiſe*, neither the minute of time, whereunto for this expreſſion of my ſelf I am confined, will admit me, nor doth my preſent aim require: [Eſpecially conſidering that I have at large delivered my ſelf to the main Head of the whole, in my Book of the *Perſeverance of the Saints*, and Anſwer to Mr. *John Goodwin* on that ſubject, now almoſt cleared off the Preſs.] For the preſent, I ſhall only ſay, That there being too great evidence of very welcome entertainment, and acceptance, given by many to an almoſt pure *Socinian Juſtification*, and *Expoſition of the Covenant of Grace*, even amongſt them, into *whoſe hearts God* ſeems *to have ſhined*, in ſome meaſure, *to give the light of the knowledge of his glory, in the face of Jeſus Chriſt*, all ſolid, learned, ſober, endeavors, for the Vindication, of the abſoluteneſs freedom, independency, and preheminence of that Grace in Jeſus Chriſt, whereby we are ſaved, will doubtleſs finde acceptance with the Children of Goſpel-Wiſdom, and all that love the glory of him that bought us. Amongſt ſuch Labors and Endeavors (Chriſt an Reader) I commend to thy conſideration, the enſuing Treatiſe, and commit thee to the Lord.

Weſtminſter, Nov. 7. 1653. JOHN OWEN.

VINDICIÆ
Justificationis Gratuitæ.

Justification without Conditions;

OR

The Free Justification of a Sinner,

Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated, from the *Exceptions, Objections,* and seeming *Absurdities,* which are cast upon it, by the Assertors of

Conditional Justification:

More especially from the Attempts
Of Mr. *B. Woodbridge* in his Sermon, Entituled [*Justification by Faith*]
Of Mr. *Cranford* in his Epistle to the Reader, and of
Mr. *Baxter* in some Passages, which relate to the same Matter.

Wherein also, the Absoluteness of the New Covenant is proved, and the Arguments against it, are disproved.

By W. Eyre, Minister of the Gospel, and Pastor of a Church in the City of *New Sarum.*

Rom. 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ.*

Dei gratia non erit gratia ullo modo, nisi gratuita fuerit omni modo, *Aug. de pec. Orig. l. 2. c. 24.*

LONDON:
Printed for *R. I.* and are to be sold by *Edward Forrest* Book-seller in *Oxford.* 1654.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
THE LIBRARY
JUNE 1, 1916

The Free Justification of a Sinner,

Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated,

from the Exceptions, Objections, and Reasonings

Of Mr. [illegible]

Mr. [illegible] in his Epistle to the Reader at the same
Mr. Barrow in some Pulpits, which relate to the same

Wherein also, the Absolutenels of the New Covenant

By W. E. Minister of the Gospel
of a Church in the City of

[illegible]

11-49

TO THE
RIGHT HONORABLE
THE
PARLIAMENT
OF THE
Commonwealth
OF
ENGLAND.

Most Noble Senators.

THe design of this Dedication, is not to call in your help and assistance to the Cause here depending, it being sufficiently guarded by a higher power, to wit, By that *Living Word*[a], which is *sharper then any two edged Sword*; and which is able by it self, to overthrow and dissipate those deep and subtile *Reasonings* which men oppose against it. That Doctrine which is armed with

[a] Heb. 4. 12. 2 Cor. 10. 4, 5.

the Authority thereof, will be ſure to ſtand, though men oppoſe it; but that which is deſtitute of this ſupport, will be as ſure to fall, though men protect it: Although I think, you to be as fit, as any company of men upon the face of the Earth, to umpire Differences of this nature; knowing that many of you have

[b] οἱ τὴν γνησιν αἰσθησεις γεγυμνασμένα. Clem. Alexand. VI. Strom.

[b] *Senſes exerciſed to diſcern between Truth and Error*; yet to be *Judges in matters of Faith*, is an honor which I dare not give you, and which I hope you dare not take. Indeed, as you are Chriſtians you ought to judge for your ſelves, and not (like thoſe Horns, which gave their power to the Beaſt) give up your Faith to the Votes of others; how Godly, or Learned ſoever they are accounted; but to make your own Judgements in Matters of Religion, a Rule or Standard for the Faith of others, and to compel them to believe, what you conceive is Truth, were to aſſume a power more then God; who though he doth

[c] Gen 9. 27.

effectually move and perſwade [c] mens hearts, yet he doth not neceſſitate them to believe, and embrace the Truth; whoſe example may inſtruct us, that Religion ought to be propagated by conviction, and not by

[d] *Religio eſt ſuadenda, non cogenda.*

compulſion [d]. It is remarkable, that they who aſcribed unto Magiſtrates a Definitive and Coercive Power in Spirituals, have (when Magiſtrates would not ſerve their turns) denied the power, which they have in Temporals; refuſing (contrary to the Rules

[e] 1 Tim. 2. 2. Jere 29. 7. Rom 13. 1.

of Chriſt [e]) to own them, pray for them, or to yeeld obedience to their lawful commands; as if none muſt hold the Sword, but ſuch as will uſe it, to fight their quarrel, and to effect that by force of Arms, which they themſelves cannot do by ſtrength of Argument. Though (bleſſed be God) we now have the counte-

nance

nance and protection of the Magiſtrate; yet we ſeek not to engage his power to extirpate, or to cut off them, that do differ from us. We deſire no other liberty for our ſelves, then what we are willing ſhould be given unto our Brethren, *Viz.* To believe and worſhip God according to the Light, which he hath given us, humbly to declare our Judgements in Matters of Faith, and with meekneſs to Reaſon out the things, wherein they and we do differ, from the Word of God.

For my own part, I look upon it as a ſpecial Mercy (for which we ow ſuitable acknowledgements, both to God and you) that although we live in times, wherein the Truth is oppoſed, and blaſphemed more then ever before; yet the Faithful have liberty to write and ſpeak in defence thereof: We may remember when it was not ſo. I wiſh that all Orthodox Chriſtians, and eſpecially our Univerſity Worthies, (who have more leiſure and far greater helps for ſuch Polemical Exerciſes, then their Brethren abroad) had more Zeal to improve this Liberty for the advantage of the Truth. The Authors of moſt of thoſe Errors and Blaſphemies which have been lately ſtarted, are but little more to be faulted, then they that do profeſs the Truth (I mean ſuch as are indued with Gifts and Abilities) who ſuffer them to walk abroad without check and controle; ſeeing there is no Error whatſoever, but the Scripture affords us variety of Weapons to wound and ſlay it. We caſt the blame upon Magiſtrates, becauſe they do ſuffer them, (nor can I excuſe their connivence at any of thoſe Evils which are contrary to the Light of Nature) yet I fear the greateſt ſhare of

this guilt will lie at our doors who are the Ministers of the Gospel, whose office (without controversie) it is, *To contend for the Faith, to convince gain-sayers*; Jude 3. *and by sound Doctrine, to stop their mouths, who teach things which they ought not.* Tit. 1. 9, 11. It is but a slender discharge of our Duty, to cry out against Errors and Heresies, and never shew and convince men what Truth and Error is; such loose and general Invectives do never advantage, most times they wound the sides of Truth; whereas, if the Trumpet gave a more certain sound, and Ministers did prove those things to be Errors, which they brand with this name, their pains would much more succeed to the profit of their Hearers, they would be better armed against such dangers.

Your late *Resolves* to emit a Declaration, *For giving fitting Liberty to all that fear God within this Commonwealth; for the better preservation of the mutual Peace of such as fear God among themselves, without imposing one upon the other; and to discountenance Blasphemies, damnable Heresies, and Licentious Practises* (in Answer to the Petitions of the Congregated Churches in the Northern Counties) I am perswaded, have exceedingly rejoyced the hearts of all the Faithful throughout the Land. Now I humbly offer it to your considerations, whether it be not a necessary expedient to preserve the mutual peace of Christians; straitly to prohibite, under fitting penalties, the giving names of obloquy, or *railing accusations (such as the Arch-angel durst not bring against the Devil,)* Jude 9. and the imposing of slanders, upon one another. I see not how any manner of good can be expected from this Practise; me thinks mens Arguments might be as keen and nervous, though their Language be sober, be-

seeming

seeming Christians, and civil Men. Such names, they do not convince, most times they harden those that are mis-led. But then the mischiefs that come by it, are not a few: I know nothing that doth imbitter the spirits, and alienate the hearts of Christians from each other so much as this; and which is worse, the Truths and Ways of God are not seldom, nor a little clouded by this means. For usually the names of the vilest Errors and Heresies, are made the Badge and Livery of the choicest Truths.

The Discourse before you, doth instance in one, the title of ANTINOMIAN (which was originally the character of loose and licentious Libertines) by some of our new Doctors, appropriated to them, who have most faithfully managed the Protestant Cause, against the Papists, and in the cheif Points which are depending between them; to wit, *Our Justification by Christ alone, without Works, and Conditions, performed by our selves; and our full and perfect Deliverance from the Curse of the Law.* Though there is no true Christian, *but will rejoyce to suffer shame, for the sake of Christ*, yet by these arts, the Ignorant and Simple have their ears stopt, and eyes shut against the Word of Life; for few have so much courage, as to look into that which is generally branded with an evil name: So that in a short time, a few nick-names shall do us more hurt, then Fire and Faggot did heretofore.

The Lord therefore keep these purposes in your hearts, till you have fulfilled them, and inable you to perfect the Work which you are called to; that the Truth may spred, and Godliness flourish, that Righteousness may be equally administred, and Wickedness

(especially in High Places) severely punished; that Learning (whereof there is so great use, both in Church and State) may be encouraged; and Peace (if possible) be restored unto us.

For the effecting hereof, I doubt not, but you have the earnest Prayers of all the Faithful throughout the Land, I can assure you, of him, who is

Yours Honors
most humble Observer,

The Fourth day of the Nineth Maneth. 1653.

W. Eyre.

TO

To

My Deare Flock in the City of NEVV-SARUM, unto which, God, and their own Choiſe, have made me an Over-ſeer.

Loving, and Beloved Brethren,

IT was a frequent ſaying in the mouth of *Luther*, *That after his death, the Doctrine of Juſtification would be corrupted.* A few years laſt paſt have contributed more to the fulfilling of his Prediction, then all the time that went before: Can there be a greater evidence of mens Apoſtacy from this Article of our Faith, then their branding of the Doctrine it ſelf, with a mark of Hereſie? Though our Adverſaries are grown more ſubtle to diſtinguiſh, yet they are as wide from the true Doctrine of *Juſtification by Chriſt alone*, as the perverters of the Faith in *Luthers* daies. It is not eaſie to number up all the *wiles* and *methods* wherewith Satan hath aſſaulted this Foundation-Truth; he knew it was too groſſe, to tell men, *That they muſt be juſtified by Works*, ſeeing the Scriptures are ſo expreſſe againſt it; And therefore mens wits muſt be ſet on work to find out ſome plauſible diſtinctions and extenuations, a little to qualifie and and ſweeten

tem

ten this Popish leaven, to take off the *odium* of the phrase, and to rebate the edge of those Scriptures which fully cut down against [illegible] of Nature, but we are justified by Works of Grace; and though we are not Justified by Legal, or old Covenant Works, yet wee are Justified by Evangelical or New Covenant Works performed by our selves; And againe, works though they are not Physicall Causes (which no man ever affirmed) yet they are morall Causes, or Conditions of our Justification; though they do not merit in a strict sense, by their innate worth and dignity, yet in a large sense, and by vertue of Gods Promise and Covenant, they may be said to merit our Justification and Salvation. Or if these will not doe it, the matter is dispatched, if Faith may be but taken in a proper sense, the *τὸ credere* fetches in all other works within its circumference. But that delusion which is least apt to bee suspected by wel-meaning Christians, is the calling Works, or Inherent Holinesse, by the name of Christ, the successe of this bait, we have seen of late in too many, who have dallied so long with the notion of a Christ within them [a], that they have quite forgotten, nay, some have utterly denied, the Christ without them, that God-man, who is the onely Propitiation for our sins.

[a] Grounded on Col. 1. 27 *Christ in you the hope of glory.* Whereas *Christ in you* is no more then Christ preached among you. *ἐν* is rendred *among* in the same verse.

How much cause then, my Brethren, have we, of continuall thankfulnesse unto our God, who in so generall a defection hath been pleased, to keep us that we are not led aside with *the deceivableness of this unrighteousnesse*, and to *lead us to that rock which is above us?* For how ever the world doth account of Pharisisme, yet they that have any acquaintance with the mind of God, know there can be hardly named a greater sin [b], then the *establishing our own righteousnesse.*

[b] *Vix ullum est peccatum, quam Justificationem, ex operibus quærere.* Twis. Vin. Grat. l. 1. p. 2. c. 2. *prope finem.*

It is *the good pleasure of God* (for which everlasting praise be given unto him) *to reveale those things unto babes, which are hiden from the wise and prudent*; The Gospel hath been, and will be a mystery to the worlds end. Humane reason cannot conceive how men should *buy without mony*; or become rich, by stripping and emptying of themselves; attain unto righteousnesse by renouncing and abhorring their own righteousnesses. Hence it is that the Doctrine of an *unconditionate Covenant*, and *the Free Justification of a sinner*, is looked upon, by our learned Rabbies

as

as such a foolish and ridiculous conceit. A great Master[c] in our Israel speaks strangely of it. *Unconditionate promises* (saith he) *beget only an irrational, fallacious, foundationless Faith, which the bigger it swells, the more dangerous it proves.* And a little after, he calls the Faith and Hope begotten by such promises, *A dependance on some fatal chain* (some Necromantick trick of believing, thou shalt be saved, and thou shalt be saved) *nay, on Satan himself, some response of his Oracle, &c.* And not much before[d], *It is a miracle* (says he) *that they who believe this Doctrine of unconditional Promises, do yet restrained from making this so natural a use of it, from running into all the vices in the World.* I remember a good Note of his, from *John* 7. 48[e], *That the greatest Scholars, are not always the soundest Christians.* We see Christianity is not Book-Learning, nor is Faith attained to by strength of parts. I should (emphatical be so bold) humbly ask this Learned Doctor, Whether the Faith and Hope of all the Saints, we read of in the Scripture, were an *irrational, fallacious,* and *foundationless Faith*? Now let him shew us any one of them, that in his addresses unto God, did ever plead a Conditional Promise? That of *Hezekiah*, 2 *King.* 20. 3. is of a peculiar consideration: I remember *Luther* calls it, *Stultiloquium Hezekiæ*[f]. Others that excuse it, say, That *Hezekiah* draws his Argument, not from his own works, but from God's; he reasons from what God had done for him, that he would do more, and bestow the mercy which then he needed[g]. But besides him, from the beginning of *Genesis*, to the end of the *Revelation*, we do not finde that any of Gods people have used any other plea unto God, or have had any other support for their Hope and Confidence; then his free promises of Grace and Mercy; not only the woman of *Canaan*, the Publican, and such as they were; but *Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, Paul, &c.* have all of them, *Fled for refuge unto these promises*; their Faith never knew any other bottom or foundation besides this. Is it an irrational thing to receive life, as a *gift*, and not as *wages*? It were very strange, if the Mercy and Faithfulness of God, should not be as sure a Foundation to rely upon, as our own Works? I will be bold to say, Whosoever do build upon other Foundations, besides the free Promise of Mercy, they will have no better success, then he who built his

[c] Dr. Hammond Sermons, p. 144.

[d] Pag. 141.

[e] At an Act Sermon in Oxon.

[f] Enarrat. in Psal. 45.

[g] Mr. *Caryl* on Job.

Matth. 15. 22. Luke 18. 13. & 23. 42. Gen. 18. 27. & 32. 9, 10. Num. 14. 18, 19. 2 Sam. 23. 5. 1 Cor. 4. 4. Phil. 3. 9.

A house

house upon the Sand, *Matthew* 7. They may (perchance, when it is too late) experiment the fallacy, they have put upon their own souls. The Doctor is as much mistaken in the use of the point, as he is in the Doctrine; to say, *That the natural effect of it, is to run into all the vices in the world*; He might have taken notice where the Holy Ghost makes another use of it, *Tit.* 2. 11. *Luke* 1. 74. 2 *Cor.* 7. 1. And right reason would have suggested, that the freer the Promise is, the more is the love and bounty of the Promiser shewn: Now Love naturally begets Love; *Publicans* (saith our Saviour) *will love those that love them*; and can a man believe so great a benefit, as the free remission of his sin, and not love him that hath remitted them? Possibly a man that hath received this Grace, but in the notion, may draw such untoward conclusions from it; but for any true Believer to sin upon this ground, is as impossible, as that light should become darkness, 1 *John* 3. 3, 9.

Matth 5. 46. Luke 7. 47.

I must confess, the loose and uneven walking of many Professors, hath given too much occasion unto Adversaries to Blaspheme this Doctrine: And though it be unjust in them, to charge the faults of Professors upon their Profession; yet you cannot but see how much it concerns them, who have hope of Salvation, through Christ alone, to vindicate the honor of this Grace, and by their exemplarinesse in well-doing, to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. The vindication of this Doctrine lies as much upon private Christians, as it doth upon Ministers; the strongest Arguments against it, are but the Suppositions, and Consequences of carnal Reason, which are soonest confuted, by a holy Conversation; in which respect illiterate men may be unfragable Disputants, and women may *nonplus* the learnedest Doctor. And therefore whilest I am in this Tabernacle, I shall not cease to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance of these things, though you know them, and are established in the present truth.

Some of you know, how unwillingly I undertook this Publick Imployment, being more inclined to the Truel, then the Sword; to build up my Hearers in their most Holy Faith, then to engage in Controversies against Opposers: And truly, nothing could have induced me to it, but the tendency of the Work to your Edification; that the simplicity of the Gospel may abide amongst you,

and

and that you may ſtand faſt in the Truth which you have received, being able to anſwer the ſcruples of them that do diſſent. It was not leaſt in my eye, That our honeſt Neighbours, (who (by the evil arts of ſome that affect preheminence) have been prejudiced and diſaffected towards us, may ſee, and ſatisfie themſelves, Whether we believe and contend for any other *Faith*, then that *which was once delivered unto the Saints*; for ſurely they will have but little comfort in departing from us, without it. I muſt needs tell them their account at laſt, will not be with joy, who have rejected the counſel of God againſt themſelves.

Whatſoever ſucceſs this Diſcourſe may finde with others, I doubt not but it will be an acceptable ſervice unto you, [illegible], that it may provoke you to be more inſtant in Prayer for [illegible] that utterance may be given me, and that my Labours [illegible] of the Goſpel, may be more ſucceſsfull unto you [illegible] that do partake of them: Which will be the great [illegible] unto him, who is

Your

The Third day of the Ninth in the greateſt Bonds,
Month. 1673.

W. Eyre.

TO THE Christian Reader.

FRIEND,

IF thou knowest me, and how many Burdens do lie upon me, I dare say, thou dost not expect an Apology for the currence of this little piece: For though considering the work, this might have had it much sooner; yet by reason of my much sickness, daily services in the Ministry, and the cares of my Family, (which are not ordinary) though I had finished it eight moneths since, it was not likely thou should have had it now. However, if any shall upbraid me, as Ecchius did Melancthon, who put to him an Answer an Argument he had put unto him [a], It is not praise-worthy (saies he) if thou dost not answer it presently: I shall say to him, as Melancthon to the Doctor, I seek not my own praise in this matter, but the truth; and perhaps it may succeed more to the advantage of the truth, that it was delayed.

I lately met with a passage, which fell from the Pen of a Leading Man [b] in these times; whereof I held it necessary to give thee my thoughts, to remove the prejudices (which probably it hath begotten against this discourse. There is (says the Author) a very judicious Man, Mr. B. Woodbridge of Newbery, hath written so excellent well against this Error, scil. Justification before the act of believing, or without conditions; and in so small room, being but one Sermon, that I would advise all private Christians to get one of them; as one of the best, easiest, cheapest preservatives against the contagion of this part of Antinomianism. It is far from me to envy the praises of Mr. Woodbridge, being ready to give a more ample Testimony to his personal worth: I do freely acknow-

[a] Id verò non est laudi dandum, si extempore respondere nequeas. Cui Melanchthon, mi Doctor non quæro meam gloriam hoc in negotio sed veritatem. Melch. Adam. in vit Melanct. f. 339.

[b] Mr. Baxter in his Epistle before his Directions for comfort.

acknowledge, that in natural and acquired parts for his time, he is like Saul amongst the people, higher by the head and shoulders, then most of his Brethren: However, (how commended out the cause he is engaged in. It is not to be wondered at, that Mr. B. hath given this superlative encomium to Mr. Woodbridges Sermon, he knew well enough, that it would rebound upon himself, Mr. W. being a son of his own Faith; and this notion of his, but a spark from out of Mr. Baxters forge, I suppose Mr. Baxters praises or dispraises, are not greatly regarded by sober-minded Christians, who have observed how highly he magnifies J. Goodwin, with others of his notion, and how slightingly he mentions Dr. Twisse, and all our Protestant Divines that differ from him. How excellently Mr. W. hath written of this matter, will appear to the impartial Examiner of this Survey. Learned Men have held, that the best way to demolish Error, is to build up Truth; as to drive out Darkness, is to let in Light: Now Mr. W. though he endeavors to prove no Justification before Faith, yet throughout all his Sermon, he never so much as hinted, how or in what sense we are justified by Faith; the Explication whereof, according to the sense of our Protestant Writers, would have ended the matter: For the Question depending between us, is not so much about the time, as the terms, and matter of our Justification, to wit, How, and by what means we are made Just and Righteous in the sight of God? Which, we affirm to be, by the perfect Righteousness of Christ alone, which God doth impute unto us freely, without Works and Conditions performed by us; though we have not the sense and comfort of it, any otherwise then by Faith. The Antecedency of our Justification in foro Dei, before Faith, is but a Corollary from this Position; and Mr. B. acknowledgeth it to be a necessary consequence, from the imputation of Christs Active Obedience[c], which hath hitherto been the unanimous Tenent of our Protestant Divines; and Mr. Norton* of N. E. thinks it no less then Heresie, to deny it. His advice, unto all private Christians to buy one of these Sermons, argues rather his conceit of himself, then his charity to them; that he dares take upon him the office of a Universal Dictator, to prescribe not only to his Kedermisterians, but to all private Christians what Books they

[c] Apbor. p. 46.

* Answer to Pinchon.

they shall read. Whether Mr. Woodbridges *Tract may be called the best amongst none good, that are written against this Truth, I shall not dispute. But that it is such an easie peece for all private Christians to understand, I do very much doubt, though the men of* Kedermisten *(who I fear are fed but with litle better food) can swallow down such cheakly morsels, as his Paradoxes and distinctions of* Faith, evidencing Axiomatically, or Syllogistically; Of Justification Impetrated, and Exemplified; Of our working actively and passively; Of Promises in the Covenant, which are not parts of the Covenant, but means to bring us into Covenant, &c. *yet unto other private Christians, I dare say they are like Herring bones in the throat, and not a whit more intelligible then a Lecture of Arabeck. The next motive, he hath hit upon, probably may take with many, the cheapnesse of the book which he doth commend; but if the price and the profe were put together, I dare say the Buyer will confesse that he hath given a great too much. He buyes poison too dear who hath it for nothing. As for the title of* Antinomianism *which he bestowes upon our Doctrine, it is no great slander out of Mr.* Baxters *mouth, with whom an* Antinomian, *and an* Anti-Papist *are* termini convertibiles. *Let him shew us any one Church or single person accounted Orthodox till this present age, that did not hold some, yea, most of those Points which he calls* Antinomianism, *and I will openly acknowledge I have done him wrong; otherwise, let him be looked upon as a Slanderer and Reviler of all the Protestant Churches, who under a shew of friendship hath endeavored to expose them to the scorne and obloquie of their Enemies. Mr.* B. (*the better to ingage his Reader*) *tells him his Doctrine* is of a middle straine *; as if all the Reformed Churches, had hitherto been in an extreame, in this fundamentall point of our Justification. It is like, he thinks the Papists are much nearer to the line of truth, then any of them. But in earnest is Mr.* Baxters *Doctrine of a* middle straine? *I am sure he gives as much unto Works and losse unto Christ then the Papists doe; He makes Works, by vertue of Gods Promise and Covenant, to be the meritorious causes of Justification and Salvation, and in no other sence doe the Papists affirm it. I must needs say, I never yet met with that Papist, which calls Christ a* sine qua non

* Ibid.

non (*i.e.* a cause which effects nothing) of our Justification: But I shall desire the Reader for his better satisfaction to parallel Mr. Baxters Doctrine with these ten Positions of Bishop Gardiner[d], which he endeavored to maintain against those blessed Martyrs of Jesus Christ, Barnes, Jerome, and Garret, who sealed the contrary Doctrine with their dearest blood.

[d] See Act. and Mon. 2 vol. p. 515. & G. Joyes first Act. 40 Winch. in prin.

1 The effect of Christs passion hath a Condition, the fulfilling of the Condition diminisheth nothing from the effect of Christs passion.

2 They that will injoy the effect of Christs passion, must fulfil the Condition.

3 The fulfilling of the Condition requireth, first knowledge of the Condition, which knowledge we have by Faith.

4 Faith commeth of God, and this Faith is a good gift. It is good and profitable for me to do well, and to exercise this Faith, *ergo*, By the gift of God I may do wel before I am justified.

5 By the gift of God I may doe well towards the attainment of Justification.

6 There is ever as much Charity towards God, as Faith; and as Faith increaseth, so doth Charity increase.

7 To the attainment of Justification, is required Faith and Charity.

8 Every thing is to be called freely done, whereof the beginning is free, and set at liberty without any cause of provocation.

9 Faith must be to me the assurance of the Promises of God made in Christ, if I fulfil the condition, and love must accomplish the condition, whereupon followeth the performance of the Promise according to Gods Truth.

10 A man being in deadly sin, may have Grace to doe the works of Repentance, whereby hee may attain to his Justification. Never did the child (*saies G. Joy*[*]) so lively resemble his own Father, as these Articles do expresse the Bishop of *Romes* Anti-christian Doctrine.

[*] G. Joy Rejoynd. fol. 1.

And as for his choise Notion of Justification by Workes, as they are our New Covenant Righteousnesse; *I finde it was a shift of the Papists long ago. The said Doctor* Barnes[e] *having cited this passage out of* Bernard[f] [*I do abhor whatsoever thing is of me, &c.*] See (*saies he*) *Bernard* doth

[e] Tr. of Justif. by Faith Theses
[f] Sup. Cant. Serm. 67.

doth despise all his good works, and taketh him onely to Grace. Now had he no works of the New Law, as you call them? *I shall not trace Mr. B. any further, there being now in the Presse (as I am informed) a large and full answer to his Paradoxicall Aphorismes, by a faithful Servant of the Lord Jesus,* a workman that needs not to be ashamed; *though I heartily wish that the work may provoke others unto shame, who have more strength, leisure, and far greater helps for such undertakings then Country Ministers. I dare say, that they who sate as the stern in our Universities heretofore such as* Reynolds, Whittaker, Davenant, Prideaux &c. *would never have indured to see so many Popish and Arminian books (far more dangerous then the Ranters blasphemous Pamphlets) shew their heads but would have sent forth their Antidotes to correct their poison. I doe speake the more freely to stir up others of greater abilities then my selfe, to undertake this cause, least it should suffer overmuch through my weaknesse in managing it. We were wont to say that if a man doth plead for the King, all is to be taken in good part: the design of this Discourse, was to plead the cause of the greatest King,* that no flesh might glory in his presence, who of God is made unto us Wisdome, Righteousnesse, Sanctification and Redemption; *though the Advocate hath not holpen the Cause, yet the goodnesse of the Cause may excuse the Advocate. I shall desire thee to read without prejudice, and either to read all, or none, for that which is curtaild in one place, is more explained in another. If thou reapest any good from what I have written, I know thy returns will be according to my hearts desire, Praises unto God, and more fervent prayers for*

Thy Servant in the Work of the Gospel.

W. EYRE.

The Third day of the Ninth Month. 1653.

† Mr. Crandon of Fawley in Hampshire.

Justification

Justification without conditions;

OR,

The Free Justification of a Sinner justified.

CHAP. I.

Shewing the occasion of this Discourse, and the rise of the Controversie which is here debated.

SInce it hath pleased the Lord to reveal the riches of his Son unto me, and to make me a Steward and Dispenser of this Grace unto his People; the cheif design of my Ministry hath been to bottom my hearers upon Christ alone [a], that they might have no confidence in the flesh [b], but in that perfect and everlasting Righteousness which he hath wrought: For which end it hath been my care frequently and clearly to demonstrate to them, both the sole-sufficiency, and efficiency of Christ in the work of Mans Redemption; that he is *able to save unto the utmost* [c], and that no work of ours, either before or after our Conversion, doth share with him in the glory of this atchievement. In a word, That there is no cause [d] without God concurring with the precious and invaluable merit of his Blood, to present *us holy, unblameable, and unreprovable in the sight of God*. Which truth, as it shines clearer then the Sun, throughout the Scripture, so it appears unto me to be of greatest moment, when I consider the concernment thereof, both to God,

[a] 1 Cor. 1. 11. Matth. 16. 18. Eph. 1. 20, 21. Isa. 28. 16.

[b] Phil. 3. 3, 9.

[c] Heb. 7. 25.

[d] *Causa* Heb. 5. 9. *Causa nostra cum Deo reconciliationis, vis unica statuitur, nulla est.* Calv. Opusc. p. 317.

If you give not all, and fully, and alonely to Christ, you deny Christ, and the Holy Ghost. Doctor *Barns* Martyr, Tr. of Justif.

and Christ, and to the precious souls of Gods Elect: I know nothing that gives so much glory unto God and Christ, as to proclaim him the *onely Saviour* [c]; and that besides him there is none other, that we ow the whole work of our Salvation from the beginning to the end unto Christ alone; and surely, there is no point in the whole Doctrine of Godliness, which contributes so much to the Peace, Security [f], and Fruitfulness of the Saints, as this doth: It affords the greatest encouragement to sinners to believe, to believers to hold fast their confidence firm unto the end, and to serve God with a willing minde, in Righteousness and true Holiness all the days of their life.

[c] Hos. 13. 4. Isai 43. 11. & 49. 26. & 60. 16. John 5. 23. Acts 4. 12.

[f] *Tutius vivimus quando totum Deo damus.*

§. 2. Now though this truth be so evident, and my intentions in pressing it, such as have been mentioned, yet it hath hapned unto me (as unto many of my betters) to be mistaken, and by some of my own Profession, who insinuated into the people, That I taught a new Gospel, made Faith and Repentance to be needless things; for no other reason, that I know of, but because I dare not give them that honor which is due to Christ, in making them concauses with him in procuring our Peace with God, and in obtaining our Right and Interest in all the Benefits which he hath purchased; for they themselves are my witnesses (would they speak their knowledge, as to matter of Fact) that in all my Exercises, though usually something of Christ be the Doctrine which I handle, yet the use that I make of it, is to press men unto Faith and Holiness: Nay, I challenge all my Adversaries to say, that ever I positively spake so much as one syllable to lessen the esteem of Inherent Holiness, though I am not ashamed comparatively to say as the Apostle doth, *That I count all things but loss and dung, that I may win Christ Jesus, Phil.* 3. 8. But otherwise, I thank the Lord, if I should speak slightingly of Holiness, my own practise would condemn my Doctrine; *For herein I exercise my self, to have always a conscience void of offence towards God, and towards men.*

[g] *Omnia quæ nunc Christianus agit Apostolus 4. ago & habeo—— Non solum opera ante justificationem facta, verum etiam quæ post justificationem fiunt. Zan. in Phil* 3. 8.

§. 3. It is needless to give the Reader an account of all the Oppositions which I have met with, in the course of my Ministery; nor are they worth the mentioning, seeing (as the Apostle [h] speaks) I have not yet resisted unto blood. I shall onely acquaint him with the rise of this present Difference, which hapned about three or four,

[h] Acts 24. 16. Heb. 12. 4.

four years ſince upon this occaſion, handling thoſe words, *How ſhall we eſcape, if we neglect ſo great ſalvation? Heb.* 2. 3. in the weekly Lecture, which I Preach in this City, I propoſed this Queſtion, *Why the Goſpel, and not the Law, is called Salvation*, ſeeing Life and Salvation is the end of both? One Reaſon which I gave in Anſwer thereunto, was, Becauſe the Law promiſeth men life but conditionally, upon condition of their Perfect Obedience; which condition no man is able to perform, and conſequently no man can attain unto Life and Happineſs by means thereof; but the Goſpel reveals a Salvation which is freely given unto Sinners, which God beſtows upon ſuch as have neither money to buy, nor worth to deſerve it. This led me to ſpeak more largely of the Difference between the Law and the Goſpel, the First Covenant, which is a Covenant of Works, and the Second, which is a Covenant of Free-grace. Concerning the latter, I laid down this *Theſis, That in the New Covenant there is no condition required on our parts to intitle us to the bleſſings of it.* One Corollary which I drew from hence, was, That Faith is not the condition of the New Covenant. I cannot without too much tediouſneſs rehearſe my Explications of this Propoſition, and I do the rather forbear it now, becauſe in the proceſs of this Diſcourſe I ſhall have more opportunity to reſcue my ſenſe of them, from ſome common miſtakes. I ſhall onely inform the Reader of one Reaſon which I then gave for proof of the laſt Poſition, to wit, That Faith is not the condition of the New Covenant, and particularly of our Juſtification (which as Mr. *W.* calls it, is the Special and Noble-bleſſing of the New Covenant) in regard that our Controverſie concerning Juſtification before Faith, grew firſt from thence. The Argument was to this effect. If Faith be the condition of our Juſtification, it muſt follow, That men are Believers before they are juſtified, (for the condition muſt be performed, before the benefit which is promiſed thereupon, can be received.) But men are not Believers before they are juſtified; the Scripture witneſſeth, that the Subject of Juſtification is a ſinner, or ungodly perſon, *Rom.* 4. 5. & 5. 8, 10. Now the Holy Ghoſt never calls Believers ungodly or wicked, but Saints, Faithful, Holy Brethren, Children of God, Members of Chriſt, *&c.*

§. 4. The next news that I heard, was, That all the Pulpits in

the Town were filled with invectives againſt my Sermon. I muſt confeſs it ſurpriſed me with no little wonder, knowing that I had delivered nothing but what was conſonant to the Scriptures, and wherein I was ſure I had the ſuffrages of many godly and learned men, and thoſe too, that are reputed amongſt the more manly ſort of our Proteſtant Divines. But that which I muſed at moſt, was the uſage of a Neighbor Miniſter, who though he heard not my Sermon; and although by reaſon of a like miſtake, he had ſolemnly promiſed me not to claſh againſt my Doctrine, until he had firſt conferred with me about it; yet ſhortly after, without giving me the leaſt hint of his diſ-ſatisfaction, he publickly complained to the people, what dangerouis Errors had been lately vented amongſt them, ſuborned the words of the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 1. 8. to pronounce me curſed, and charged the people not to hear them that do teach: (1) That the New Covenant is not conditional; (2) That Faith is not the condition of the New Covenant; or (3) That Juſtification goes before Faith. To let paſs thoſe odious Nick-names which my Neighbors, and others (who have been invited hither to diſaffect the people towards my Doctrine) have frequently beſtowed upon me (as *Antinomian, New-Declarative, Troubler of Iſrael, &c.*) which troubled me the leſs, when I remembred what *Luther* ſayes, *He that will Preach Chriſt truly, and confeſs him to be our Righteouſneſs, muſt be content to hear, that he is a pernitious fellow, and that he troubleth all things, &c.* And a little before, *The faithful muſt bear this name and title in the World, that they are Seditious and Schiſmaticks, and the Authors of innumerable Evils, &c.* And in another place, *viz.* on *Gal.* 5. 11. *Paul* (ſaith he) *taketh it for a moſt certain ſign, that it is not the Goſpel, if it be preached in peace.* But that which grieved me moſt, was, That Satan had gotten ſuch an advantage againſt my Miniſtry; for thoſe inſinuations prevailed ſo far upon the people, that many of my wonted hearers fell off, and refrained from coming to my Lecture, for fear leaſt I ſhould perſwade them to believe ſome other Goſpel, then that which is revealed in the Scriptures: And how to remove this offence, ſo unjuſtly taken, I could not deviſe; for though I made things never ſo plain in Publick, thither they would not come; or if I had gone to them in Private, it had been but to little purpoſe, they being poſſeſſed

Luther on Gal. 1. 29.

(as

(as one of them most uncharitably told me) that I had a design to vent new Doctrine in Publick, and to blanch it over *with* a fair construction in private. It came into my minde (as the most likely expedient to vindicate both the truth and my self) to desire those Reverend Ministers, who sometimes came unto my Lecture, That if they were dis-satisfied with what I had delivered, they would be pleased publickly to declare it, assoon as Sermon was ended, and show me wherein I had swerved from the truth. I hoped that by this means, we should have a clearer understanding of one another, and the people would be the better satisfied, when they had compared their Exceptions, and my Answers together. But hitherto I could never obtain this favor from them, though some of them have taken the Liberty to clamor lustily against me, behinde my back, and when I was safe enough from giving them an Answer.

§. 5. About *April* last (which was *Anno* 1652.) I came unto the Wednesdays Lecture in this City, where I heard a stranger * (whom I knew not) let fall sundry Passages, which I conceived to be very wide from the Orthodox Faith, as well as contrary to the Doctrine which I had lately delivered in the same place. It sounded harshly in mine ears, *That the Elect themselves* (to whom Christ was peculiarly given by the Father before the foundations of the world; for whom Christ gave himself a Sacrifice of a sweet smelling savor, whose sins he bare in his Body on the Tree, even to a full propitiation) *had no right or interest in Christ, nor any more benefit by his death, then reprobates, till they did believe; and that they are but dreamers who do conceit the contrary.* I know not what could be spoken more contradictory to many plain Scriptures, which shall be mentioned anone, more derogatory to the full atonement which Christ hath made by his Death, and more disconsolatory to the souls of men, in laying the whole weight of their Salvation upon an uncertain condition of their own performing: And therefore after the Exercise was fully ended, I desired the Minister that Preached, that with his leave, and the patience of the Congregation, I might remonstrate the insufficiency of his Grounds or Reasons, to uphold the Doctrine he had delivered; three of which I took more especial notice of. One was drawn from the parallel between the first

* Mr. *Warren* of *Houghton* in *Hampshire.*

and the ſecond *Adam*, *As men* (ſaid he) *are not guilty of* Adams *ſin, till they have a Being; ſo the Elect have no benefit by Chriſt, till they have a Being*; whereunto he added thoſe old Philoſophical Maxims, *Non entis non ſunt accidentia*, and, *Accidentis eſſe, eſt ineſſe*. Another was, *That where there is no union, there can be no communion; but there is no union between Chriſt and the Elect, before they believe: Therefore the Elect have no communion and participation in the benefits of Chriſts death, before they have a Being, and do believe in him.* The proof of the Aſſumption was managed thus. *The union between Chriſt and the Saints is a perſonal union, which cannot be ſuppoſed till their perſons have a Being.* A third ground (upon which he laid the greateſt ſtreſs) was to this purpoſe, *The Elect have no benefit by Chriſt before they do believe, becauſe God hath made a Covenant with his Son, That they for whom he died, ſhould be admitted to partake of the Benefits of his death, by Faith.*

§. 6. Whereunto my Replies were to this effect. I told him that I conceived his firſt Allegation made very much againſt him; For if the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt doth come upon all the Elect unto Juſtification, in the ſame manner as *Adams* ſin came upon all men to condemnation, as the Apoſtle ſhews it doth, *Rom.* 5. Then it muſt follow, That the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt was reckoned or imputed to the Elect, before they had a Being, and then much more before they do believe in him; for it is evident that *Adams* ſin came upon all men to condemnation, before they had a Being; for by that firſt tranſgreſſion (ſayes the Apoſtle, *verſ.* 12.) *Sin entered into the world.* And more plainly, *Death paſſed upon all men:* The Reaſon follows, becauſe *in him*, or in his loyns, *all have ſinned.* Now as in *Adam* the οἱ πολλοὶ, that is, All that ſhall periſh, were conſtituted ſinners, before they had a Being, by reaſon of the imputation of his diſobedience to them; ſo in Chriſt the οἱ πολλοὶ, All that ſhall be ſaved, were conſtituted righteous, his obedience being imputed unto them by God, before they had any Being, otherwiſe then in him as their Head and common Perſon. There is a late Writer who tells us, that there is not the ſame Reaſon for the imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to all the Elect before they believe; as there is for the imputation of

Mr. *Burges* of *Juſtif.* p. 180, 186.

Adams

Adams sin unto his posterity before they have a Being; *Because* (says he) *the issues of the first Covenant fell upon* Adams *posterity in a natural and necessary way, but the issues of Christs death do come to us in a supernatural way.* But this Reason seems to me to be of small validity; for the issues of *Adams* disobedience came not upon his posterity by vertue of their natural propagation; for then his sin should be imputed unto none, until they are actually propagated; and the sins of other parents should be imputed to their posterity as much as *Adams*, because they descend as naturally from their immediate Parents, as they do from *Adam*; so that the issues of *Adams* sin may be said to descend to his posterity in a supernatural way, *i. e.* By vertue of Gods Covenant which was made with him as a common person, in behalf of all his posterity; and in the same manner do the issues of Christs obedience descend unto Gods Elect, by vertue of that Covenant which was made with Christ, as a common person, in their behalf; and therefore unless they can shew any *Proviso*, or restriction in the second Covenant more then in the first, why life should not flow as immediately to the Elect from Christs obedience, as death did from *Adams* disobedience, the Argument will stand in force. But to return to my discourse with Mr. *Warren*: I added, That those Logical axioms, *non entis, &c.* have no force at all in the present Controversie: It doth not follow that Christs Righteousness cannot be imputed to us, before we have an actual created Being, because accidents cannot subsist without their Subjects; for as much as imputed Righteousness is not an accident inherent in us, and consequently doth not necessarily require our existence. Christ is the Subject of this Righteousness, and the imputation of it is an act of God. Now the Apostle hath observed, That God in justifying, and imputing Righteousness, *calleth things that are not, as if they were, Rom.* 4. 17. As the Righteousness of Christ was actually imputed to the Patriarks before it was wrought; and our sins were actually imputed to Christ before they were committed; so I see no inconvenience to say, That Christs Righteousness is by God imputed to the Elect, before they have a Being.

§. 7. As to his second Reason before mentioned, I excepted (as I conceive but justly)

1. Against his calling our union with Christ *a personal union*, which

which ſeems to favor that abſurd notion [b], That a believer loſeth not onely his own proper life, but his perſonality alſo, and is taken up into the Nature and Perſon of the Son of God. Divines do call our union with Chriſt, a Myſtical and Spiritual union, becauſe it is ſecret and inviſible, to be apprehended by Faith, and not by Senſe or Reaſon; but the Hypoſtatical or Perſonal union is proper unto Chriſt, in whom the Divine and Humane Nature do conſtitute but one Perſon.

[b] See Dr. *Chambers* Animadverſ. Sect. 11. B.

2. Againſt his Aſſertion (propoſed Univerſally,) *That there is no manner of union between Chriſt and the Elect, before they do believe*; for though there be not that conjugal union between them which conſiſts in the mutual conſent [i] of parties, yet is there ſuch a true and real union, that by means thereof, their ſins do become Chriſts, and Chriſts Righteouſneſs is made theirs. God from everlaſting conſtituted and ordained Chriſt, and all the Elect to be (as it were) one Heap or Lump, one Vine, one Body or Spiritual Corporation, wherein Chriſt is the Head, and they the Members; Chriſt the Root, and they the Branches; Chriſt the Firſt Fruits, and they the reſidue of the Heap [k]. In reſpect of this union it is, That they are ſaid *to be given unto Chriſt, and Chriſt to them*; to be *in Chriſt, Epheſ.* 1. That they are called his Sheep, his Seed, his Children, his Brethren, before they are Believers: And by vertue of this union it is, That the obedience and ſatisfaction of Chriſt, deſcends peculiarly to them, and not unto the reſt of mankinde. But here I was aſſaulted with an Objection, which the Reverend Miniſter of the Pariſh was pleaſed to move from *Rom.* 16.7. Where *Paul* ſpeaking of *Andronicus* and *Junia*, ſaith, *They were in Chriſt before me:* From whence he would infer, That none are in Chriſt, or united unto Chriſt before they do believe. Whereunto I returned no Anſwer, but humbly deſired him to leave the manage of the Conference unto him that had Preached: I did the rather paſs it over, in regard there is ſo little difficulty therein; for it is evident, the Apoſtle ſpeaks there, not of their Spiritual union with Chriſt, which is inviſible to man, for God onely knows who are his, but of ſuch a

[i] *Conſenſus facit matrimonium.*

[k] Heb. 2. 11. He that ſanctifieth, and they that are ſanctified (*i. e.* they whoſe ſins were purged by his blood) are ἐξ ἑνὸς, whereunto ſome do make σώματος, others φυράματος, to be the Subſtantive. *Vid. Jun. Paral. l.* 3. God by his Election from Everlaſting framed a new body of Humane race (oppoſit to the firſt, whereof *Adam* was the Head) and appointed Chriſt to be its Head, *Diodat.* on Epheſ. 1. 4. All our Divines do define the Catholike Church to be *Cœtus Prædeſtinatorum*, The whole company of Gods Elect.

Being

a Being in Christ, as is by External Profession and Church Communion[1]; in which respect the whole visible Church is called CHRIST, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. And Hypocrites, as well as the Elect, are said to be in Christ, and to be Branches in him, *John* 15. 2, 3. And thus it is acknowledged, that one is in Christ before another, according as they are called, and converted, whether really or in appearance: It doth not follow that the union of the Elect to Christ is successive, or that it is an act done in time, depending upon conditions performed by them.

[1] See *Diodat* on Rom. 16. 7.

§. 8. To prevent the like interruptions, I desired the Preacher to vouchsafe us the proofs of his third Ground (which in his Sermon he had but barely asserted) *scil. That God hath made a Covenant with Christ, that the Elect should have no benefit by his death, until they do believe*; which I have often heard affirmed, but never proved. Whereunto he replyed, That I should produce some Scripture which sayes, That the Elect have actuall benefit by Christ, before believing; wherein, if I had failed, it had been but a weak proof of his Assertion, for he having the Affirmative, the Confirmation of it lay on him. However I readily condescended to his demands, and proposed an Argument to this effect. They with whom God hath declared himself to be wel-pleased and reconciled, have actual benefit by the death of Christ: But God hath declared that he is reconciled unto, and wel-pleased with all those for whom Christ hath died, *Ergo*. To confirm the Assumption which was then denied, I alledged *Matth.* 3. 17. (intending to have added divers other Scriptures, as 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *Rom.* 5. 10, *&c.* when I had made out the force of the former place,) *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am wel-pleased.* From whence I reasoned after this manner; If the wel-pleasedness of God, which is here declared, were not terminated to Christ personal, but to Christ mystical, then God was wel-pleased with all his Elect, (who are Christ mystical) when this voice came from Heaven, and consequently before many of them do believe: But the wel-pleasedness of God here declared, was not to Christ personal, *Ergo*. Here Mr. *Good* an Inn-keeper of this City put me that Question, which Mr. *Woodbridge* hath mentioned, *Pag.* 21. *Whether God were wel-pleased with unregenerate men?* To whom I did not Reply, as *Basil* did unto *Demosthenes*, the Clerk of

of the Emperors Kitchin, when he affronted him for oppoſing the *Arrian* Faction, οὐ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ζωμοῦ κεφαλῆς κρατεῖν. Wiſhing from my heart, That all the Lords people were Prophets; that private Chriſtians would labor for a more explicite Faith in the Grounds of Religion: And therefore I anſwered, That this and other Scriptures do plainly declare, That he is wel-pleaſed with his Elect in Chriſt, whileſt they are unregenerate; though he be not pleaſed with their unregeneracy, or any of their actions in their unregenerate eſtate. Then Mr. *Woodbridge* interpoſed, That the place aforecited did not prove the actual reconciliation or wel-pleaſedneſs of God towards his Elect, but onely that he was wel-pleaſed with the perſon of Chriſt; or if we will extend it unto men, that then the meaning was, I will be wel-pleaſed, or I am wel-pleaſed, when I am wel-pleaſed, whenſoever it is: Whereunto I returned no Anſwer, but deſired the Congregation to judge how well this gloſs did agree unto the Text. I am wel-pleaſed, *i.e.* I will be wel-pleaſed. To ſay God is not wel-pleaſed, when he himſelf ſayes expreſly, That he is, is not to interpret Scripture, but to deny it; ſuch a liberty to alter Tenſes and Forms of Speech at our pleaſure, will but juſtifie the Jeſuites * blaſphemy, That the Scriptures are but a Leaden Rule, and a Noſe of Wax, which may be turned into any Form. In regard there were ſo many Speakers at once, to avoid confuſion, I proceeded no farther in that Conference.

* Hoſius, *l.* 3. *de Auth. ſcrip.* Pighius, *l.* 1. *de Hier. Eccleſ.* Caſan. *in Epiſt. ad Bohen.* 2 & 7.

§. 9. The next day Mr. *Warren* came unto my Lecture; and after Sermon was ended, though he had nothing to except againſt my Doctrine, yet he offered me ſome other Arguments to confirm his own, *ſcil.* That the Elect have no benefit by Chriſt, till they do believe: To which I returned ſuch Anſwers, as I conceived expedient, to clear the truth; without giving him the leaſt offence in word, or geſture, that I was aware of, notwithſtanding the provocations I received from him, both in the Language he gave me, abuſing thoſe words of our Saviour, *Matth.* 26. 54. To compare himſelf unto *Chriſt*, and me unto *Judas*, *&c.* And in the challenges he made, to Diſpute, Write, *&c.* whereunto I was willingly deaf, leaſt our Doctrinal Difference might prove a Perſonal Quarrel. His Arguments and my Anſwers I ſhall here omit, in regard the ſame were urged by Mr. *Woodbridge* with much more

ſtrength.

ſtrength. The ſcanning of whoſe Book is my preſent intendment.

§. 10. On the Wedneſday after (about half an hour before Sermon began) I was informed that Mr. *Woodbridge* was to Preach. In regard he was none of the Lecturers, I concluded he had abode in Town, and procured a turn purpoſely to blow the Coals, which Mr. *Warren* had kindled, and to foment the prejudices of the people, both againſt the truth, and my ſelf. And therefore having begged direction of God, I was preſſed in my ſpirit to go and hear him, and to bear witneſs to the truth, if it were oppoſed; and I bleſs the Lord his ſtrength and aſſiſtance was not wanting to me. Had Mr. *Woodbridge* faithfully related the procedure of our Conference, I had not put my ſelf to the trouble of this Reply. But ſeeing he hath repreſented my Judgement in this point, with the Grounds thereof, in ſo ill a dreſs, I ſhall endeavor to ſet thoſe things ſtrait, which are caſt by him into ſuch a crooked frame: And that I may omit nothing which makes for him, and againſt my ſelf, I ſhall give the Reader my ſence of his whole Book. But before I proceed to the *examen* of his Sermon, I muſt crave leave to premonſtrate the Reaſons of my Practiſe in this Publick Conference.

CHAP. II.

A Digreſſion, concerning the propoſing of Queſtions, and reaſoning with Miniſters publickly about the Matter of their Sermons.

IT may ſeem ſtrange to ſome, that I ſhould ſo publickly except againſt my Brethrens Doctrine, ſeeing it hath been ſo ſeldom practiſed in our Congregations; and therefore I ſhall by way of Apology offer them the Reaſons that moved me to it.

1. I did no more then what I have often deſired ſhould be done to me, if any were diſ-ſatisfied in the Doctrine which I had taught. *Hanc veniam damus, petimuſque vicisſim.* And of all men, Mr. *Warren* had leaſt reaſon to be offended with it, who had

practised the very same thing in another place[a]; unless he be resolved to take that liberty, which he will not give.

2. Having a Ministry committed to me in this place, by the appointment both of God and Man, I looked upon it as my duty, to witness against those Errors that intrench so nearly upon the Foundation, as I conceive this doth, which I have engaged against. But some will say, I might have discharged my Conscience at another time, and with more deliberation. I must confess, I have alwayes highly esteemed that saying of *Aristides*, who being demanded by the Emperor to give a sudden answer, unto something propounded, Replyed, *Do you ask to day, and I will answer to morrow*: And the like of *Melancthon*[b] to *Ecchius*, who had put him a knotty Argument, *Cras tibi respondebo*. Indeed sudden Answers are seldom sold, especially in weighty matters. But the case here was such as would not admit delay; for I knew the greatest part of the Hearers (whose prejudices by this means were strengthned against me) would not vouchsafe to come at another time, when I had more opportunity to speak unto them. I dare say, that all that were present at Mr. *Woodbridges* Sermon, knew that he had levelled his Discourse against my self; now if I had kept silence then, and shewn my dislike of his Doctrine at another time, what ever I had said, would have been but little regarded; my Adversaries would have given forth, that I had spoken that behinde his back, which I was not able to maintain unto his face.

3. The Points which these Ministers handled, were Controversal; and surely Controversies are much better managed in a Conference between the Parties dissenting then in a continued Discourse, when the same man shall frame both Arguments and Answers to his own advantage.

4. I see no inconvenience at all, that can come of this practise, but rather very much good, were it more generally received in our Congregations; That if a Minister do deliver any thing that is dubious, he should be desired after his Exercise is ended, to clear and explain it; or if any thing contrary to truth, he should by sound Doctrine be convinced thereof; which if it were done with that meekness and gravity as becometh Christians, without jeering, railing, and such like personal provocations, it would very much tend unto godly edifying.

§. 24.

a At *Rumsey Toward* one Mr. *Symonds* whom he charged with sundry Errors, as soon as he had ended his Sermon, and desired the people not to believe a word which Mr. *Symonds* had taught, how justly I cannot tell.

b *Melch. Adam. in vit. Melanct.* p. 339.

§. 2. And (first) on the Ministers part, it would make them more studious, and careful to weigh and ponder what they do deliver in Publick; were this course more frequently used, many would not do the work of the Lord so negligently, as they are wont to do it, and especially when they think there is none that heeds them, or that durst to gain-say their crudest notions. Then (secondly) on the peoples part, it is a singular means (1) to increase their knowledge, and to maturate their judgements in the Articles of our Faith; for it is far easier to judge and discern of controverted Points, when they are debated in way of Conference, then when they are delivered in a continued Discourse; especially seeing the Speaker is seldom so ingenuous, as either rightly to search, or to urge the strength of his Adversaries Tenents. (2) To confirm and establish them in the truth, which they have already received, for *Nihil iam certum, quam quod ex dubio certum.* Men abide by those truths which they have throughly tryed. (3) To hinder the spreading of many dangerous Errors which are sometimes vented in our Publick Auditories, and which the common people are ready to swallow without chewing. (4) To prevent sundry mistakes, which are occasioned through the obscurity, ambiguity, or narrowness of mens expressions.

§ 3. Though custom hath not brought it in credit amongst our selves, yet is it not any novel practise.

1. We finde that the Jewish Doctors (as bad as they were) gave liberty to the people, publickly to ask them Questions for the better understanding of the Doctrine which they taught; they would never else have allowed our Saviour, being but a Childe of twelve years old, to have asked them Questions, and to make Answers and Replies to what they spake, as they did *Luke* 2. 46, 47. For at another time when he did something which was unusual, they took him up with a *quo jure, By what authority, &c. Matth.* 21. 23. It is observable, that this was done in the Temple, and not in a private House, and when a great Congregation was present; *For* (saves the Text) *all that heard him, marvelled, &c.* Mal. 2. 7.

2. We have the example of the Apostles to justifie us herein, whom we finde as frequent in Disputing, Arguing, and Reasoning with them that opposed the truth, as in their continued Discourses

amongst the people, *Acts* 6. 9. & 9. 29. & 17. 2, 17. & 18. 4, 19. & 19. 8, 9. & 15. 7. amongst themselves.

3. We have also the practise of the Primitive Churches, going before us in this particular. In the Church of *Corinth*, not onely one, but any one (except women) was allowed to speak in the Publick Assemblies, for the edifying of himself, and others, 1 *Cor.* 14. 29, 31. See *Vers.* 26. Upon which Text (especially) it was, that Archbishop *Grindal* grounded the Exercise of Prophesying, which he, with the consent of the other Bishops, set on foot in the Province of *Canterbury*, as appears by his Letter concerning that Matter unto Queen *Elizabeth*; the reviving of which, would not be the meanest peece of that Reformation which hath been attempted.

4. *Pauls* dealing with *Peter* is very considerable, *Gal.* 2. the Text says, *ver.* 11. That *he withstood him to the face*, and *vers.* 14. *that he reproved him before them all*, *i. e.* before the whole Congregation, though it were for a matter of fact, yet will it not follow, that we should be more indulgent unto Errors in Doctrine; no doubt, but *Paul* would have deal as roundly with *Peter*, or any other, if he had taught any thing contrary to truth, we see his zeal for the simplicity of the Gospel. *Vers.* 5. *To whom* (*scil.* the false Apostles) *we gave no place, no not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you.*

d See *Luther* on Gal. 2. 11.

5. It is more then once charged upon us Ministers, that we should *convince gain-sayers, and stop their mouths, who teach things which they ought not* (not by procuring the Magistrate to put them to silence, but) *by sound doctrine*, *i. e.* by clear and demonstrative Proofs from the Holy Scripture, *Titus* 1. 9, 11.

6. And lastly, If every Christian ought to give a Reason of the hope that is in him, as it is enjoyned, 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. and as it was wont to be publickly practised in the Primitive Churches[e]; much more ought a Minister of Christ (who should be apt to teach, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2.) to be willing to satisfie his hearers concerning the Doctrine which he hath delivered.

e *Vid. Beza* in Matth. 3. 6.

Object. 1. §. 4. Object. 1. *All that I have heard objected against this practise is of little moment. At first, some have alledged, That the Disciples came privately to our Saviour to ask him Questi-*

ons,

ons, *Mark* 10. 10. *Mark* 9. 28. To which I Answer.

Answ. 1. Though it were in a house, yet it was before all his Disciples, some did put to him these Questions before the rest; and I suppose, That they who dissent from us in this matter, do look upon all that come unto our Churches to be Disciples. 2. The Negative is weakly concluded from the Affirmative: It doth not follow, That because they came unto him privately, therefore they might have asked him these Questions in a Publick place; seeing our Saviour never forbad them to do this thing, before the people: Surely, he that so readily made answer to all the Cavils of his enemies, would not have refused to satisfie the Doubts, Cases, or Questions of his own Disciples, wheresoever they had put them to him. 3. Though Questions which are meerly for private satisfaction, should be privately proposed, yet such as tend to the edifying of others, and to the clearing of such things as are openly delivered, are most conveniently moved in the Publick Assemblies. But 4. what is this instance to a Ministers witnessing against false and Erroneous Doctrines which are vented amongst the people committed to his charge? *Answ.*

Object. 2. *Others have alledged, That the Apostle reprehends perverse disputings,* 1 *Tim.* 6. 5. *Object.* 2.

Answ. True, and justly too: But will it follow from hence, That all Publick Disputations, and Reasonings about matters of Faith, are perverse Disputings? Was the Apostle to be charged with perverseness when he reasoned both with Jews and Gentiles, as his manner was? Those perverse Disputings, *vers.* 4. are called strifes of words; but such is not the matter which we do differ about, which on all hands is confessed to be of very great moment. *Answ.*

Object. 3. *Some have objected that prohibition of the Apostle,* Rom. 14. 1. *Receive him that is weak in the faith, but not to doubtful Disputations.* *Object.* 3.

Answ. 1. The scope of the Apostle was not to prohibite Disputations concerning matters of Faith, before such as are weak, but to exhort stronger Christians to be tender and charitable to their weaker Brethren, whom he would have them to receive, *scil.* Into Church Communion, and to own in the Fellowship of the Gospel, although they were not so fully informed as themselves in- *Answ.*

in the Doctrine of Christian Liberty, concerning the distinction of Meats, days, and other Mosaical Observations: Our Translators in the Margent render the last Clause, *Receive him--- not to judge his doubtful thoughts*, q. d. Do not judge him an unbeliever, because of his Doubts and Scruples about these indifferent matters; or do not perplex and intangle him with Niceties, least his Faith in the main be utterly subverted: There is a vast difference between those *adiaphora*, which the Apostle speaks of, and the points which are in difference between us. (Mr. *Cranford* says well) *That these Controversies concerning our Justification, are no strife about Goats Wooll.* 2. This prohibition makes as much against Preaching of those points which do stumble the weak, as against the discussing of them by way of a Conference whatsoever is necessary to be taught the people, is as necessary to be tryed and examined by them.

Epistle to the Reader.

Object. 4. §. 5. Object. 4. *It hath been also alledged (which doth cast the greatest odium upon this practise) That these Publick Disputations do thwart with those Precepts which require us* to seek and follow after Peace, *as Rom.* 12. 18. & 14. 19. & 15. 2. *Eph.* 4. 3.

Answ. *Zanchy. Tom.* 2. *fol.* 302. *Ans.* For my own part, I see not the least contrariety between them. It was the Judgment of a great Divine, *Hæc unica eaque sola via est, qua ad concordiam proximè pervenìri potest, &c. This is the one, and onely way, whereby we may most suddenly attain to concord; if whatsoever things may be, or are commonly said for any Opinion, or against it, be truly propounded in the Churches; so that the people be allowed free judgement in all things, &c.* In my Opinion they take a wrong course to make Peace, that go about to stop mens mouths, and never satisfie their Judgements; for from hence innumerable Discords must needs arise. Me thinks Christians (who are sensible of their many mistakes) should not be so strait laced, as to resolve to be at Peace with none, but such as will *jurare in verba*, Say as we do. A late Writer sayes well, *Why may not Christians and Scholars write plainly against one anothers Judgement, with a loving consent?* So say I, Why may we not Reason against each others Opinions in a friendly manner? But (2) if Discord and Dissention should arise by this means, yet is it not a Natural, but an Accidental Effect thereof:

Mr. *Baxter.*

Malum per accidens non destruit bonum per se.

thereof? And thus the Gospel is still the occasion of more disturbance, as our Saviour foretold, Matth. 10. 34, 35. Is it the Gospel to be charged with these Dissentions? Or ought we therefore to forbear to Preach the Gospel? The proper cause of these Dissentions are mens own corruptions; it is their vain fancies, which soon cannot suffer their Opinions to be distinguished and examined by the Word, but strait waged their Passions are up in arms, and hold them for their Enemies that do differ from them. It is a sign they are more tender of their own credit, then of the truths of Christ. 3. Though Peace be a Jewel of great price, yet that Peace is far too dear which costs us the loss of Truth[f], I mean of any Saving, Necessary, and Fundamental Truth. For though in some lesser points, *Inquibus salvâ fide qua Christiani sumus, ignoratur verum*, as *Augustine* speaks[g], we may for peace sake *have our faith, or perswasions to our selves*, Rom. 14. 22[h]. Yet sure in those great and weighty matters of the Gospel, which are either Foundations, or else are adjacent to the Foundation (as these Controversies about Justification are, it being *articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*, as *Luther* calls it) we ought not out of love to Peace, to betray the Truth. It is better that Offences should come, then that any vital truth should be lost or imbeached[i]; it is far more eligible to have truth without peace, then peace without saving truth; *The wisdom which is from above, is first pure, and then peaceable.* All those Precepts which do call for Peace and Unity, are bounded with a *salvâ fide*; as that Rom. 12. 18. *If it be possible*; now *Id solum possumus, quod non possumus*, nothing is possible, but what is lawful; so that if we may with a good Conscience, and without treachery to the truths of Christ, we ought to live peaceably with all men. So Rom. 14. 19. it is not barely, *Follow after peace*; but *peace and the things which make for edification*, it must be an edifying, and not a destroying peace; such as may promote, and not hinder the building up of the Church. Vid. Rom. 15. 2. and 1 Cor. 14. 29. The unity we are bid to strive for, Eph. 4. 3. *is the unity of the Spirit*[k], and not like that of *Simeon* and *Levi*, who were Brethren in iniquity. For as one[l] observes well out of *Basil* the Great, *If we once shake the simplicity of the Faith, Disputes and Contentions will prove endless.* 4. If Christians in their Publick Disputes

[f] *Pax est omni bello tristior, quæ veritatis, & justitiæ ruina constat.*

[g] De Pec. Orig. cap. 23.

[h] *Dissidiis magnis & controversis, non sunt redimendæ miris istæ veritates.* Acont. Stratagem. Satan. [illegible] *unitas habetur, illum nasci permittitur, quem ut veritas relinquatur.* Greg. hom. 7 in Ezek. ex Aug. Jim. 3. 17.

[k] *Ea enim sola Ecclesiæ pax est, quæ Christi pax est.* Hilar. Gen. 49 5.

[l] Dr. *Reynolds.*

 putes

putes, do so far forget the Rules of Sobriety and Moderation, as to betake themselves to those Carnal Weapons, of Jeering, Scoffing, and Reviling each other, it is an Iniquity to be punished by the Judge, because it tends so directly to the breaking of our Civil Peace, and is more scandalous in them, then in any others. Would the Civil Magistrate interpose himself so far as to be the Moderator of our differences in this behalf, these Publick Debates would be of singular use.

CHAP. III.

Being a Survey of Mr. Woodbridges *Title Page, wherein the Opinion he oppoſeth, is cleared from the Aſperſion of Antinomianiſm.*

IT is a common saying, *Fronti nulla fides.* We may no more judge of Books by their Titles, then of Strumpets by their Forcheads; or of Apothecaries Drugs by the Inscriptions of the Pots which do contain them, whose out-sides many times are Remedies, when the inside is stark poyson. The natures of things do not always answer the Names and Inscriptions which are put upon them. We read of *Pompey*, that he built a Theater *Cum titulo Templi*; and of *Apolinarius* the Heretick, That he had a School *Cum titulo Orthodoxi*. *Neſtorius* also vailed himself [illegible] *Montanus*, who would have our Saviour to be [illegible], assumed unto himself the Title of *Paracletus*; nay, *Apelles* the Painter drew his filthy Strumpet, *Cum titulo Veneris*, with the Inscription of a Goddess, that so he might more easily bring men to the adoration of her. There is nothing more common, then for men to adorn their Errors with the Robe of Truth, and to deform the Truth with the Rags of Error. I hope therefore, that the Reader will be more wary, then to judge of this mans Doctrine by the specious Title, which he gives his own, or that black mark wherewith he hath branded the Opinion which he doth oppose.

He calls his own Opinion [*Justification by Faith*] and the Doctrine

Doctrine he oppoſeth, an [*Antinomian Error*] both which may be underſtood *Per antiphraſin*, for Juſtification by Works, and an Evangelical Truth. As for his own Opinion, he had more fitly ſtiled it [*Juſtification by Works*] taking Faith as he doth, in a proper ſence, and attributing no more to Faith, then to other works of Sanctification, which in his ſence do morally qualifie men for Juſtification, and Salvation. I cannot think him a hearty Advocate for Juſtification by Faith, who holds, That we are not juſtified till the day of judgement; which I am credibly informed this Author hath Publickly maintained, ſince he Preached this Sermon [b]: But how ill his Book doth deſerve this Title, ſhall appear in diſcuſſing the parts of it.

[b] At *Brayton* before many Miniſters, &c.

§. 2. And as for the imputation he hath caſt on our Doctrine, (which he calls an *Antinomian Error*) I doubt not, but it will redound more unto his ſhame, then unto ours. It hath been an old continued practiſe of Satan, to blaſt the truths and wayes of God with odious Nick-names, purpoſely to deter the ſimple from looking into them; as few men will come near to a houſe which is marked for the Plague. It were eaſie to fill a Volume with thoſe opprobrious Terms and Titles, which in all ages have been caſt upon the Truth, and the Profeſſors of it. Sure I am, Satan hath gained no ſmall advantage by theſe Helliſh means. *Tertullian* obſerves, That the Chriſtians were hated and perſecuted for no other crime, but the crime of their Name [c]. So there are many things in theſe days generally decryed, that are onely guilty of an evil name. I doubt not but there will be found many a precious truth in theſe Bundles of Errors, which have been heaped together by ſome Godly-men in this laſt age. 'Tis but an eaſie Confutation to cry out Error and Hereſie; and this I have often obſerved, That they who are moſt liberal with theſe looſe invectives, are generally ſparing of ſolid Arguments.

[c] *Nomini ſtimen.* Tert. Apol.

Whether the Opinion which Mr. *W.* oppoſeth, be an Error, *ſub judice lis eſt*; How well he hath acquitted himſelf in the proof of his charge, we ſhall ſee anon. For my own part, I diſlike not his or any other mans Zeal againſt Errors and Hereſies, provided they will allow that liberty unto others, which they aſſume to themſelves; to witneſs againſt that which they conceive Erroneous. I cannot be perſwaded by all that Mr. *W.* hath yet ſaid, That this

Tenent of Justification *in foro Dei*, without Works or Conditions performed by us, is an Error, much less an *Antinomian Error*. If we may judge of it, by those general *Diagnosticks*, which Divines have given us to discern between Truth and Error; I am sure it hath the complexion of a saving truth: That Doctrine which gives most glory unto God in Christ, is certainly true, and the contrary is as certainly false. *Let that* (sayes *Bradwardine*) *be acknowledged for the true Religion, which gives most glory unto God, and renders God most favorable and gracious unto man*[a]. Now let such as are best in the Church judge, which Opinion gives most glory unto God; Either (1) that which ascribes the whole Work of our Salvation to the Grace of God, and the meritorious purchase of Jesus Christ; or (2) that which makes men Moral causes of their own salvation; which ascribes no more unto Christ, then the purchasing of a new way, whereby we may be saved; if we perform the terms, and conditions required of us. If the former in his Judgement be *Antinomianism*, I shall freely profess, That by it alone (though he call it Heresie) I have hope of Life and Salvation.

[a] *Quæ Deo honorabilior, pacificabilior, hominiq; favorabilior.*

Acts 24. 14.

§. 3. I am sure he is greatly mistaken, if he derives the descent of this Doctrine from the *Antinomians*, who were a Sect of *Libertines*, or carnal *Gospellers*, which appeared in *Germany* soon after the Reformation began, *scil.* about the year 1538[b]. The Ring-leader whereof was *Islibius Agricola*, the Compiler of the *Interim*; they merited this name of *Antinomians* by their loose Opinions, and looser Practises, against whom *Luther* wrote several Books, and *Calvin* bitterly inveighed in his *Instr. Adversus Libertin.* who (as I shall shew anon) are no Enemies to the Doctrine which I do here maintain. That sort of Christians in former times were called *Ennomians*, from *Eunomius* their Leader, of whom Saint *Augustine* [f] gives us this Character, *Fertur usque adeo fuisse bonis moribus, inimicus asseverare, quod nihil cuiquam obesset quorumlibet perpetratio ac perseverantia peccatorum, si hujus quæ ab illo docebatur, fidei particeps esset.* i. e. *It is reported, That he was such an Enemy to all goodness; that he affirmed, though a man did commit or lie in any kinde of sin, it should never hurt him, if he had true that Faith which he taught.* Of the same strain were the

[b] *Hoc anno prodiit secta eorum qui dicuntur Antinomi.* Sleid. Com. l. 12. fol. 159.

[f] De Hæresib. c. 54.

Gnosticks,

Gnosticks, who for their filthy lives, were called *Cerinth*, The dirty Sect. g *Augustine* observes, That there were many of this spirit in the Apostles days, as the *Nicholaitans*, the Disciples of *Simon Magus*, *Basilides*, *Valentinus*, who abused some passages in the writings of *Paul*, to be as it were Panders to the flesh; who because the Apostle had affirmed, That a man is justified by Faith without works, concluded, That if men did believe, *Etiamsi male operarentur, & fœnorosè, flagitiosève viverent, Though they lived never so wickedly, they should be saved.* Which filthy Dreamers (as *Jude* calls them) occasioned the Epistles of *James*, *Peter*, *John*, and *Jude*; the chief scope of which is to shew the unsoundness of that Faith, which doth not work by love, and that they are not Believers who do not bring forth the Fruits of a holy life. Now me thinks Mr. *W.* should have more charity, then to rank his Antagonists with such filthy Swine.

g Fide & Operib. c. 14. lb. q. 76. in Octoginta tribus quæst.

§. 4. Mr. *W.* is not ignorant, I dare say, that many Godly Learned Men have asserted the Justification of Gods Elect, *in foro Dei*, before Faith, who were never accounted *Antinomians*. I am sure Mr. *Pemble* hath hitherto been known by another name; I mention him the rather, because he was Divinity Reader in that Society h, where I my self, and this Author (for a while under me) had our education. In his Book of the Nature and Properties of Grace and Faith, he delivers his Judgement to this effect, i *That the Elect, even whilest they are unconverted, they are then actually justified and freed from all sin by the death of Christ; and God so esteems of them as free; and having accepted of that satisfaction, is actually reconciled to them:* And a little after, *Our Justification in Gods sight, was purchased for us by Christ, long before we were born; for it is in vain to think with the Arminians, That Christs merits have made God onely* Placabilem, *not* Placatum, *procured a freedom, That God may be reconciled if he will; and other things concur, but not an actual reconciliation: No it is otherwise, Full satisfaction to Divine Justice is given and taken; all the sins of the Elect are actually pardoned. This was concluded upon, and dispatched between God and Christ, long before we had any being, either in Nature or Grace; yet this benefit was ours, and belonged to us,*

h *Magdalen Hall* in *Oxon.*

i Vind. Grat. p. 21. & 23.

though we knew not so much, till after that by Faith we did apprehend it, as Lands may be purchased, the Estate conveyed, and setled on an Infant, though he know nothing of it, till he come of age. Mr. *Rutherford*, I dare say, was never suspected to be an *Antinomian*, yet in his *Exercit. Apologet.* (a Book which Mr. *W.* in my hearing heretofore hath extolled to the skies) he hath said as much as any of us, against whom Mr. *W.* hath levelled this opprobrious name: [k] *Same prius quam electus credit, cessit, &c. Verily* (saith he) *before any of the Elect do believe the wrath of God, and all the effects of his wrath are removed from their persons by vertue of Christs satisfaction:* And near the same place he speaks to this purpose, *Though we are not justified passively, or terminatively* (*i.e.* The gracious sentence of God is not terminated in our Consciences) *till we do believe, yet our justification actively considered, as it is in God* (*who is the only justifier*) *was compleat and perfect, before we had a being; and in this sence Faith is not the Instrument of our Justification.* Dr. *Twisses* Judgement in this point is sufficiently known. *The Righteousness of Christ* (saith he [l]) *was ours, before we did believe; ours, I say, in respect of right, because in the intention both of the Father, and the Son, it was performed for us; though not in respect of possession and enjoyment, because we have not the sence and knowledge of it, whereunto we do attain by Faith---- For Faith coming* (*which the Spirit of God works in our hearts*) *the love of God to us in Christ is then perceived and acknowledged. Whence it is, That the Righteousness of Christ is said to be imputed unto us by Faith, because we cannot know and discern that it is imputed to us but by Faith; and then we are said to be justified with that kinde of Justification and Absolution from sin, which breedeth peace in our Consciences.* Where he also gives us two Arguments to prove, That Justification, *in foro Dei*, goes before Faith. Was this famous Doctor an *Antinomian*? Of all men Mr. *W.* (who is now entered upon his Labors, and reaps the Harvest of that Seed which the Doctor with much sweat and many Prayers hath sown at *Newbery*) hath least reason to account him so. I must needs tell him, He will not honor himself, by aspersing the name of this blessed man. If Mr. *W.* had consulted with the Writings of his own fore-

[k] Rhætorf. Exercite Apologet. pro Grat. p. 45.

Pag. 43.

[l] Vind. Grat. l. 1. p. 2. Sect. 25. n. 5. p. 197.

fathers,

fathers, I suppose he would have given the adherers to this Doctrine more civil language. Mr. *Parker* his Grandfather (a man whom his Enemies[m] admired for his Learning and Piety) in his Book *Descensu Christi ad inferos*, hath this excellent passage[*], *Justificatus Christus dicitur cum resurrexit*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *Nos, in eo resurgente* justificati, Rom. 4. *ult. quia ista solutio*, i. e. *Suscitatio patris*, actualis justificatio *fuit, illius quidam a peccatis aliorum pro quibus satisfecit*; Nostrum *vero a peccatis propriis pro quibus ille vadimonium præstitit*. i. e. *Christ is said to be justified when he rose from the dead*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *And we to be then justified in him*, Rom. 4. ult. *Because that discharge, to wit, His Fathers raising him from the dead, was an* ACTUAL JUSTIFICATION *of him from the sins of others, for which he had satisfied; and* OF US *from our own sins, for which he became a surety*. It doth not a little justifie them, that drave away this Reverend man from his Native soyl, that a Grand-childe of his own, a Minister, and a Minister in these times, should brand him with Heresie.

§. 5. To these might be added many more, who have not hitherto been known by the name of *Antinomians*. Mr. *Calvin* saith, *That our Justification, in respect of God, doth precede our Faith*[n]. *Zanchius* in his Explication of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, upon those words, *Chap.* 2. 5. [*He hath quickned us together with Christ*,] says, *That all the Elect, who are the Members of Christ, when he by his death had expiated their sins, were freed from the guilt of eternal death, and obtained a right to eternal life*. *Chemnitz* hath much to this purpose, *Nobis potius est persuasissimum, &c. We are most certainly perswaded, that our sins are pardoned before we do believe; for we deny that Infants do believe, and yet Infants have their sins forgiven*[o]. And a little before, *viz. Chap.* 6. of the same Book[p], *I deny* (saith he) *that Faith is the cause of our Justification, for then our Justification would not be of Grace, but of our selves; but Faith is said to justifie, not because it effecteth Justification, but because it is effected in the justified person*. And in another place to the same purpose[q]. *Faith doth neither merit, obtain, nor begin our Justification; for if it did, then Faith should go before Justification, both in nature and time; which may in no wise be*

[m] *Quem nos jactent admirari soliti, &c.* Crakanth. Log. Prædic. ubi. *Lib. 3. sect. 30. p. 59.

[n] *Fidei porro ita justificationem, præcedit, at tamen Dei respectu sequitur*, Calv. Antid. Conc. Tridens. Sess. 6. p. 282.

[o] Cham. Panstrat. Tom. 3. L. 13. c. 10. sect. 18.

[p] Cap. 6 sect. 4.

[q] Lib. 12. c. 12. sect. 5 & sect. 9.

be granted, for Faith it ſelf is a part of Sanctification; now there is no Sanctification, but after Juſtification; Quæ re & natura prior, which is really, and in its own nature before it. *Alſtedius* in his Supplement to *Chamier* ſaith[r], *That Faith concurs no otherwiſe to Juſtification, then in reſpect of the paſſive application, whereby a man applies the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt unto himſelf; but not in reſpect of the active application, whereby God applieth unto man the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which application is in the minde of God*, and conſequently from eternity. Dr. *Macouvius*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Franeka*, hath a whole Determination to this purpoſe[s], to prove that Juſtification actively conſidered, or as it is the act of God, blotting out our ſins, and imputing the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt unto us, goes before Faith: Indeed he makes it to be, not an immanent, but a tranſient, declared act, which the Lord did, when he firſt promiſed to ſend his Son to be our Mediator, *Gen.* 3. 15. Though one of our late Writers[t] mentions this Doctors Opinion, with much contempt and oſcitancy, calling his Aſſertions, *Strange, ſenceleſs, and abhorred* (which is the leſs to be regarded, ſeeing he uſually metes out the ſame meaſure unto all men elſe, whoſe notions do not ſquare with his own mould, as to Dr. *Twiſſe*, Mr. *Walker*, and them that hold the imputation of Chriſts active Righteouſneſs, whom he calls *A ſort of ignorant and unſtudied Divines, &c.*) Yet, as he hath merited fairer uſage amongſt Chriſtians for his other Labors: So, I dare ſay, his Arguments in this particular, will not ſeem ſo weak and ridiculous, as Mr. *Baxter* makes them, to an indifferent Reader that ſhall compare them, with the Exceptions which he hath ſhaped unto them; ſharp Cenſures are but dull Anſwers. Dr. *Ames* his Colleague[u], ſayes no leſs, who in his *Marrow of Divinity*, having defined Juſtification to be the gracious Sentence of God, by which he doth acquit us from ſin and death, and account us Righteous unto life, he ſayes, *That this ſentence was long before in the minde of God, and was pronounced when Chriſt our Head aroſe from the dead*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. And in another place[x], *All they for whom Chriſt, in the intention of God, hath made ſatisfaction, are reconciled unto God.* I might produce many others that are of eminent note, who have aſſerted, That all the Elect are reconciled and juſtified before

[r] Lib. 2. c. 11. ſect. 6.

[s] Diſputat. An. 1612. Diſp. 17.

[t] Mr. *Baxter* in Append. p. 147.

[u] *Ames* Med. l. 1. c. 27. ſect. 9.

[x] *Omnes illi pro quibus Chriſtus ex intentione Dei ſatisfecit, ſunt Deo reconciliati. i. e. In favorem ſalutiferum aliquo modo reſtituti*, Antiſinod. p. 164.

before they believe. Now were all these Champions of Truth, a pack of *Antinomians* and *Libertines*? Hath Mr. *Woodbridges* humanity no better language to bestow upon them? If he shall say, he doth not mean them, yet his reproaches do fall upon them; for if *Titius* be an *Antinomian*, for saying, That the Elect are justified before they do believe; *Sempronius* is an *Antinomian*, who affirms the same.

§. 6. Mr. *Burges* (a man somewhat profuse in this kinde of Rhetorick) seems willing to excuse some of those fore-mentioned Divines, who have asserted the Remission of sins before Faith [y], because *they did it in a particular sence to oppose the Arminians*, who maintain a reconciliability, and not a reconciliation by the death of Christ. But I believe he is not ignorant, that Divine Truths are not to be measured by mens intentions; let mens ends be never so good, they cannot make Error to be Truth; or if they are never so corrupt, they cannot make Truth to be Error. Nor do they, whom he calls *Antinomians*, assert Justification before Faith, in any other sence, then in respect of the absolute and immutable Will of God, not to deal with his people according to their sins; and in respect of the full satisfaction of Jesus Christ, who by that *one offering of himself, hath perfected for ever, them that are sanctified, i.e.* them whose sins are purged by his blood. I could shew how frequently he and others have wounded some of our most eminent Divines, both for Learning and Piety, through the sides of *Antinomians*: Mr. *Burges* in his Book of *Justif. p.219.* calls it *An Antinomian Similitude*, to say, That as a man looking on the Wall through Red Glass, conceives the Wall to be of the same colour; so God looking upon us in Christ, seeth nothing but the Righteousness of Christ in us, and no sin at all: Which Similitude is used by Dr. *Reynolds* in his Excellent Treatise on the 110 *Psalm* [z], where he doth plainly assert that Doctrine which Mr. *Burges* condemns for *Antinomianism*. Mr. *Baxters* Character of an *Antinomian*, will bring all our Protestant Writers under this censure: For with him they are *Antinomians*, who hold, (1) That our Evangelical Righteousness is without us in Christ, or performed by him, and not by our selves [a]. Or (2) That Justification is a free act of God, without any condition on our part, for the obtaining of it [b]: Or else (3) That Justification is an Immanent

[y] Treat. of Just. p. 177.

Heb. 10. 14.

[z] Pag. 450.

[a] Aphor. p. 109, 111.

[b] Ibid. p. 169, 170.

nent act [c], and conſequently from eternity [d], which was the Judgement of *Alſted*, *Pemble*, *Twiſſe*, *Rutherford*, &c. Or (4) That we muſt not perform duty for Life and Salvation, but from Life and Salvation; or that we muſt not make the attaining of Juſtification or Salvation, the end of our endeavors, but obey in thankfulneſs, and becauſe we are juſtified and ſaved [e], &c. Now let any man who is moderately verſed in our Proteſtant Writers, but ſpeak, on whom this Arrow falls. I might inſtance in many others, but I will not put the Reader unto ſo much trouble.

[c] Ibid. p. 173.
[d] Ibid. p. 93.
[e] *Saints Reſt.* p. 14. Append. p. 100.

§. 7. My buſineſs at preſent, is to acquit this Doctrine of Juſtification *in foro Dei*, before Faith, from Mr. *Woodbridges* charge of *Antinomianiſm*. And truly I wonder, that he ſhould give it this name: For 1. It hath not the leaſt affinity with the *Antinomian* Tenents, which as they are related by *Sleiden*, were, That the Law is not to be Preached to bring men to Repentance, or unto the ſight of their ſins; That what ever a mans life be, though it be never ſo impure and wicked, yet he is juſtified for all, if he doth believe the Promiſes of the Goſpel [f]: So that they held the neceſſity of Faith, (ſuch as it was) they made it (as our Adverſaries do) the condition of Juſtification. 2. *Antinomianiſm* is ſuch an Error, as doth oppoſe, or is contrary to the Law of God: But ſurely, this is not ſuch, it offers no manner of injury unto the Law; ſeeing that whenſoever the Elect are juſtified, they are not juſtified without Righteouſneſs, and ſuch a Righteouſneſs, as doth fully anſwer the Law of God, in reſpect both of the ſatisfaction and obedience, which it doth require. We ſay, that God cannot juſtifie a perſon without Righteouſneſs, for then he ſhould do that himſelf, which he forbids to us, and profeſſeth his deteſtation of, *Exod.* 23. 7. *Iſa.* 5. 23. *Deut.* 25. 1. *Prov.* 17. 15. If God could have diſpenſed with his Law in this behalf, Chriſt needed not to have died; the end of his coming was to bring in Everlaſting Righteouſneſs. Whomſoever God doth juſtifie, they have juſtice one way or other; for otherwiſe, the God of Truth ſhould call darkneſs light, and evil good; they whom he accounteth juſt, are juſt and righteous: But yet we ſay, That Faith is not that Righteouſneſs, that makes them ſo, either in whole or in part; but the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which is put upon them. Now to ſay, That God imputes this Righteouſneſs unto men before they believe, is

[f] *Ipſi vero ſtatuunt, quæcunque tandem ſit hominis vita, & quantumvis impura, juſtificari tamen eum, ſi modò promiſſionibus Evangelii credat*, Sleid. loc. ſup. citat.

no

no ways contrary to the Law, seeing the Law prescribes not the rules of this imputation, it is altogether besides the cognizance of the Law: So that if it prove an Error, it must be an *Anti-Evangelical*, and not an *Antinomian Error*. But I doubt not, but I shall be able to acquit it from this, as well as from that other imputation.

CHAP. IV.

Containing some Animadversions upon Mr. Cranfords *Epistle to the Reader.*

MR. *W.* for the better grace of his Book, hath obtained a Commendatory Epistle from Mr. *Cr.* wherein some things are delivered contrary to truth, and most injurious to them, whom Mr. *W.* hath made his Adversaries. Its true, he begins his Epistle with a deserved Commendation of the Doctrine of Justification, *That it exceedingly illustrates the glorious riches of Gods Free-grace, and magnifies his Justice, is the onely support of comfort to a wounded Conscience, takes away from man the cause of boastings, and is altogether above the invention and credulity of Reason.* Wherein I do cordially concur with him, accounting it (as *Luther* did) the Sun which enlightens the Church, the Paradise and Heaven of the Soul; therefore it was not without cause, that our first Reformers so earnestly contended for it, it being (as they have well observed) the sum of the Gospel, and of all the benefits which we have by Christ; the principal point of the Doctrine of Salvation, the pure knowledge whereof doth preserve the Church. How much short of them in this particular, is the zeal of some amongst our late Reformers, who have scoffingly called it, the *Antinomian* common place? Mr. *Cranfords* Testimony therefore to the singular excellency of this Doctrine, is so much the more welcome, seeing there are so few that have it in a right esteem; though as he (and much more as Mr. *W.*) hath stated it, the beauty and lustre of it, is not a little obscured. It looseth all those praises which in Mr. *Cranfords* Parenthesis are

Vid. Luth. in Psal. 130.

Calv. in Rom. 1. 17. *Luther Sup.*

aſcribed unto it. For (1) how doth the riches of Gods grace appear, if our Juſtification doth depend upon terms and conditions, performed by us? For as Mr. *Walker* [b] hath noted, *Whatſoever is covenanted and promiſed upon a condition to be performed, is not abſolutely free, nor freely given.* They are not juſtified by Grace, who are juſtified upon the performance of conditions. (2) What ſupport is this for a wounded Conſcience, to tell him that is conſcious of his extream weakneſs, and inability, That God will forgive his ſins, if he do perform ſuch and ſuch conditions; which he is no more able to do, then to remove a mountain? Mr. *Calvin* hath well obſerved, *Niſi fidem tremere ac vacillare volumus* [c], *&c. That unleſs we would have our faith to be always wavering and trembling, it ought to reſt onely upon the free promiſe of Grace in Jeſus Chriſt*; And he gives this Reaſon for it, *Quoniam conditionalis promiſſio, &c. Becauſe a conditional promiſe which ſends us to our own works, promiſeth us life no otherwiſe, then if it were placed in our own power.* Nor (3) doth this take from men the cauſe of boaſting; Boaſting (ſaith the Apoſtle) is not excluded by works, call them by what name you will, either Legal or Evangelical; if they are our works, they give to us occaſion of boaſting; for to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt; a work or condition whenſoever it is performed, makes the thing covenanted, a due debt, which the performer may demand, and the promiſer is bound to give. (4) It is not above the invention and credulity of Reaſon, That God ſhould juſtifie a Righteous man, but that God ſhould juſtifie ſinners, and meerly upon the account of anothers righteouſneſs; as heretofore it ſeemed fooliſhneſs both to Jews and Gentiles, ſo ever ſince it hath been a ſtumbling block to the wiſdom of the fleſh; it is ſuch a myſtery as will never contemper with the moſt rational principles of the natural man. Hence have ariſen all thoſe jarrings and contendings againſt this truth, in regard of its diſproportion unto carnal Reaſon, which believes no other Goſpel, but *hoc fac & vives*.

[b] Socinian. p. 224.

[c] Calv. Inſt. l. 3. c. 2. ſect. 29.

Rom. 3. 27.

Rom. 4. 4.

§. 2. *The Doctrine of the Goſpel* (ſayes Mr. *Cr.*) *concerning the Juſtification of a believing ſinner, is plainly delivered in the Scripture.* But by his favor, the Scripture no where calls Believers ſinners, nor yet makes Believers the adequate ſubjects of Juſtification.

Justification. It is most true, That all Believers are justified, and it is as false that men are Believers, before they are justified: An unjustified Believer, and a justified Sinner, are expressions palpably guilty of Self-contradiction. We read in Scripture of Gods *justifying the ungodly* [d], *reconciling the world* [e], *and enemies to himself* [f], and of his *quickning them that are dead in trespasses and sins* [g]. Now Believers (as hath been hinted [h]) are never called ungodly, or enemies to God; they are no where said to be dead in trespasses and sins; they have their name from their better part, and from that esteem that God hath of them, who beholds them holy and righteous, without any spot or blemish of sin [i].

d Rom. 4. 5.
e 2 Cor. 5 19. i. e. *Homines ex toto mundo electos ad salutem.* Vid. Estium in loc. *Electos vocat mundum, non solum quia in mundo, sed de mundo sunt, natura nihil aliud quam mundus erant*, i. e. *Peccatores, damnati, ac inimici Dei.* Vid. Ferum in Joh. 3. 16.
f Rom. 5 8, 10.
g Ephes. 2. 1, 5.
h Sup. cap. 1. sect 3.
i Cant 4. 7. Psal. 51. 7. Col. 1. 22. Eph. 5. 27.

§. 3. In the next place Mr. *Cr.* gives us in a List of all the causes which do concur unto our Justification; in the enumeration whereof, he will finde the Author he commends at a greater distance from him, then those whom he opposeth. He may, if he please, compare his Doctrine with Mr. *Baxters* Notions (whom Mr. *W.* follows at the very heels) *Thes.* 56. 26, 73, *&c.* in his *Aphorisms*, who denies, That Christs obedience is the material, the imputation of his Righteousness, the formal cause of our Justification, or that Faith is the Instrument, by which we do receive it; he plainly ascribes the same kinde of causality unto Christ, and Faith making them to differ onely *secundum magis & minus*; that Christ is the *sine qua non principalis*, and Faith the *sine qua non minus principalis* (he might have listed sin in the same rank; which too, is a *sine qua non* of our Justification;) That Faith and works in a larger sence, are meritorious causes of Life and Blessedness. Now we say with Mr. *Cr.* (1) That God is the efficient cause, or the onely Justifier; that he hath no motive or inducement, but his own Grace and Love, to will not to punish us, and to give to us his Son, thorow whom we have Redemption, and Deliverance from the curse of the Law. We say too (2) that Christ is the onely meritorious cause of our Justification (taking Justification *pro re volita*, for a transient effect of the Will of God;) that Jesus Christ hath by his death and satisfaction, fully procured and merited our Discharge and Absolution from the penalty of the Law, which we deserved by sin: For which cause, he is said to have *purged our sins by himself*, *i. e.* Without the help and assistance

Deut. 7. 7. Rom. 3. 25. John 3. 16.

of other means, *Heb.* 1, 3[k]. There are many who *ore tenus* in word do acknowledge, That Christ is the meritorious cause of our Justification, that in deed do deny it: The Papists in the *Counsel of Trent*[l] say, That *God is the efficient, the glory of God the final, the death of Christ the meritorious cause of our Justification.* But yet we know, that they allow not this effect unto it, unless other things do concur on our parts: they say, That Faith, Charity, &c. do *Impetrare remissionem, & sua quidem modo mereri; Obtain, and after a sort merit forgiveness, though not by their own worth and dignity, yet by virtue of God's Covenant and Promise.* Too many of our Protestants (setting aside the word merit, which yet Mr. *B.* thinks may be admitted) do tread directly in their steps; they ascribe as much unto works, as Papists do. It is a poor requital unto Jesus Christ, to call him the Meritorious cause of our Justification, and in the mean while to deny the merit of his death, as to the immediate purchases thereof, and to ascribe at least a partial meritoriousness to other things. (3) I shall go further with Mr. *Cr.* I freely grant him (which I believe Mr. *W.* will stick at) That Faith is the Instrument, by which we receive and apply the Righteousness of Christ unto our selves, whereby the gratious sentence of God, acquitting us from our sins, is conveyed and terminated in our Consciences. We say indeed, That Faith doth not concur to our Justification, as a proper Physical Instrument (which is a less principal Efficient cause.) Mr. *Rutherford* saith well[m], That Faith is not the Organical or Instrumental cause, either of Christs satisfaction, or of Gods acceptation thereof on our behalf. By believing we do not cause, either our Saviour to satisfie for our sins, or God to accept of his satisfaction: Every true Believer is perswaded, That God hath laid aside his wrath and displeasure towards him for his sins, having received a sufficient ransom and satisfaction for them in the death of his Son. *Sed hoc fides non facit,* (saith he) *sed objectum jam factum præsupponit.* Faith is a Receptive, not an Effective Instrument, an Instrument not to procure, but to receive Justification and Salvation, which is freely given us in Jesus Christ. It is called an Instrumental cause of our Justification, taking Justification passively, not actively; or in reference to that passive Application, whereby a man applies the Righteousness of Christ to himself,

[k] *Excludere voluit omnia alia media vel adminicula, cum purgationis & pretium & virtutem in Christo statuit.* Calv. in loc.

[l] Sess. 6. Can. 7. *Bellarm.*

[m] Exercit. Apol. p 421

Alsted. in Supplem. Cham. ut sup.

self, but not to that active Application, whereby God applyeth it to a man, which is onely in the minde of God. Therefore *Calvin* [n] calls Faith, *Opus passivum*, a passive work. [n] *Calvin* in Joh. 6. 29.

§. 4. Mr. *Cr.* proceeds, *This Doctrine* (saith he) *hath in all ages been opposed and obscured, sometimes by open Enemies, sometimes by professed Friends, and such as would be accounted the great Pleaders for Free-grace.* It is most true, That this Article of Free Justification hath, and will be a Bone of Contention to the worlds end. It is the chief cause of all those contests and quarrels, which have arisen between the Children of the Free-woman, and the Children of the Bond-woman. Mr. *Fox* [o] hath well observed, *It is so strange to carnal Reason, so dark to the World, it hath so many enemies, that except the Spirit of God from above do reveal it, Learning cannot reach it, Wisdom is offended, Nature is astonished, Devils do not know it, Men do persecute it.* Satan labors for nothing more, then that he may either quite bereave men of the knowledge of this truth, or else corrupt the simplicity of it. It is not unknown what batteries were raised against it, in the very infancy of the Church, how the Wits and Passions of men conspired to hinder it; what monstrous consequences, were charged upon the Doctrine; and what odious practises, were fathered upon them, that did profess it; never was any truth opposed with so much malice and bitterness as this hath been, and by them especially that were most devout and zealous [p]. But when it could not be withstood and stifled, Satan endeavored then to deprave and adulterate it, by mixing of the Law with the Gospel, our own Righteousness with Christs; which corruption the Apostle hath strennously opposed in all his Epistles, and more especially in that to the *Romans* and *Galatians*; where he excludes all and singular works of ours, from sharing in the matter of our Justification: For the eluding of whose Authority, carnal Reason hath found out sundry shifts and distinctions, As that the Apostle excludes onely works of Nature, but not of Grace; Legal, but not Evangelical works; and that our works though they are not Physical, yet they may come in as Moral causes of our Justification. It is certain, That the most dangerous attempts against this Doctrine, have been within the Church, and by such as Mr. *Cr.* calls Professed Friends, who have done so much the more mischief, in regard they, [o] Epistle before *Luther* on Gal. [p] Acts 13. 50. Rom. 10 pr. See Gal 5. pr.

they were leaſt apt to be ſuſpected: Juſtification by works was generally exploded amongſt us, whileſt it appeared under the names of *Popery* and *Arminianiſm*, which ſince hath found an eaſie admittance, being vented by ſome of better note, ſuch as would be accounted Pleaders for Free-grace.

§. 5. *Mr.* Woodbridges *Diſcourſe* (ſaith Mr. *Cr.*) *deals not with the Errors of Papiſts, Socinians, Arminians, but with Antinomian Error.* How unjuſtly our Doctrine is called *Antinomian*, hath been ſhewn before; and Mr. *Cr.* may be pleaſed to take notice, That Mr. *Rutherford* accounts the Opinion we oppoſe, the very cheif of the *Arminians*, *Socinians*, and *Papiſts Errors* about Juſtification, to wit, That no man hath his ſins remitted before he doth actually believe [q]. As for his Allegation out of Mr. *Shepherd*. *Mark thoſe men that deny the uſe of the Law to lead unto Chriſt, if they do not fall in time to oppoſe ſome main point of the Goſpel, &c.* It doth not touch us, for we deny not the uſe of the Law to bring men unto Chriſt; we look upon the Law, as the Ordinance of God, to convince men of their ſin and miſery, and thereby to indear to them the Grace of the Goſpel, *Gal.* 3. 22, 24. We ſay with the Apoſtle, *The Law is good, if men do uſe it lawfully. i. e.* In a way of ſubſerviency, and attendance upon the Goſpel, the better to advance and make effectual the ends thereof. And as we deny not this uſe of the Law, ſo neither doth our aſſerting, *That all the Elect before their converſion, and Faith ſtand actually reconciled to God, and juſtified before him, obſcure the Goſpel.* I doubt not but the judicious Reader will expect a better proof of this charge, then *Cranfords* word. Have all thoſe Reverend Divines before mentioned, obſcured the Goſpel? What is the Goſpel, but the glad tidings, that Chriſt is come into the world to ſave ſinners; that by his ſubjecting of himſelf to the curſe of the Law, he hath freed them from the curſe, who were given him by the Father? How is this truth obſcured, by our ſaying, That God did everlaſtingly will, not to puniſh his Elect; and that in Chriſt he beholds them juſt and righteous, even whileſt they are ſinful, and wicked in themſelves? Do not they much more obſcure the Grace of the Goſpel, who make it depending upon terms and conditions, performed by us, then we, that affirm it to be free and abſolute? They that aſſign no certain

[q] Apologit. Exercit. p. 17. *Arminianis nihil prius eſt in votis, &c.*

1 Tim. 1. 8.

certain and actual effect, to the death of Christ; or we, that say (according to the Scripture) that all the Elect were thereby freed from the Law, delivered from the Curse, reconciled unto God, made perfect and compleat in the sight of God? And therefore though Dr. *Downham* doth call it, *A strange Assertion*, I shall not be ashamed to own it: The Lord complains, *That the great things of his Law were counted strange*, *Hos.* 8. 12. We read in *Eusebius*, That the Christian Faith (though it were from the beginning) was called Νέα καὶ ξένη, *New and strange*. The multitude cast this aspersion upon our Saviours Doctrine, *Mark* 1. 27. and the *Athenians* upon *Paul*, *Acts* 17. 19, 20. The imputation of novelty and new-fangledness, hath been commonly cast upon the truths and ways of God: Many things are new in respect of Observation, which are not so in themselves [r]. We have known, that godly men have looked upon some things as very strange, which in tract of time have been generally imbraced. Dr. *Downham*, no doubt, thought it strange, that any godly man should say the Angels of the Seven Churches were not Diocesan Bishops; and yet I believe Mr. *Cr.* is not of his Opinion. If it were the Doctors meaning, That this Assertion of *Justification before Faith*, was never heard to come from the mouth of a godly man, before *Pemble*; either his memory was very weak, or his charity was too much straitned. He could not be ignorant of what hath been alledged out of *Calvin*, *Zanchie*, *Parker*, *Chamier*; one of those passages in *Chamier* (before mentioned) is cited by the Doctor in that very Book [s] which Mr. *Cr.* quotes. He knew likewise, That all our old Protestant Divines have defined Justifying Faith, to be a certain perswasion, and full assurance of the pardon of our sins; from whence it must inevitably follow, That pardon of sin precedes our Faith, for every object is before its act. And as strange as it seemed unto this Doctor, he himself sayes [t] little less; for in answer to *Bellarmine*, (who would prove that a man may be justified without special Faith) he granteth, *It is true in respect of our Justification in the sight of God; which special apprehension, or application of Christ* (saith he [v]) *though scorned by Papists, yet it is of all Graces the most comfortable, most profitable, most necessary, most comfortable; for the very life of this life, is the assurance of a better life; most necessary, because*

[r] See *Bolton* of Error, p. 147.

[s] N. Con. p. 136.

[t] *Downh.* of Justif. l. 6. c. 6. sect. 9.

[v] Lib 6. c. 4. sect. 5.

without this ſpecial receiving of Chriſt, firſt by apprehenſion, and then by application we can have no other ſaving Grace: How can we love God, or our Neighbor for his ſake? how can we hope, and truſt in him? how can we rejoyce or be thankful to him, if we be not perſwaded of his love, and bounty towards us? Moſt profitable, becauſe from it all other Graces do proceed, and according to the meaſure of it, is the meaſure of them, &c. Doubtleſs, That Faith to which theſe properties do belong, doth beſt merit the name of Juſtifying Faith: So then according to this Doctors Judgement, the Aſſertion is not ſo ſtrange as true.

§. 6. Mr. *Cr.* goes on, and much faſter then a good pace, [*This Opinion* (ſays he) *that the Elect are actually reconciled to God before they believe, is confuted in this Treatiſe, and proved contradictory to Scripture, fit only* (1) *to ſow pillows under the elbows of prophane men*; (2) *to overthrow the comfort of Believers, deſtroying the ground, nature, and end of Faith.*] How ſolidly it is confuted, the Reader will ſee anon, when the weight of his proofs ſhall come to be examined; I doubt not, but an impartial Judge will acquit it, both from being contradictory to Scripture, or guilty of thoſe horrid Conſequences which he hath caſt upon it. I marvel, that ſo rational a man (as Mr. *Cr.* is held to be) ſhould ſay, That all this charge is proved; part of which is not ſo much as mentioned by Mr. *W.* (who is liberal enough of his criminations,) which makes me to think, That he writ his Epiſtle, before he read his Author, or at leaſt, That he is a man that will be ſatisfied with ſlender Proofs againſt perſons, and Doctrines which he doth not fancy. It is true, Mr. *W.* hath endeavored to obtrude upon us ſome ugly Conſequences, which are as remote from our Doctrine, as Earth is from Heaven. Mr. *Cr.* is not ignorant, how much peaceable and prudent men have diſliked this practiſe of wyer-drawing mens Opinions, and raking abſurdities out of them (*per neſcio quas fidiculas conſequentiarum*, as Biſhop *Davenant* [2] expreſſeth it) *By ſmall threds of conſequencies, which they themſelves do diſclaim, and abhor from their whole heart*; whereupon ſayes that Learned Biſhop, *Good men ought to deal more fairly, then to faſten an Heretical ſence on other mens words, when the Writers themſelves, which*

[2] Adhort. ad pacem. c. 12. p. 153. Vid. *Chillingworths* Anſwer to *Knots*, p. 39, 40.

are

are the best Expounders of their own words, can, and use to reduce them to a Catholick sence. Mr. Cr. knows, That the very same Consequences are fathered upon the Doctrine of absolute Election, Justification by Faith alone, and the certain perseverance of true Believers. The *Semi-Pelagians* of old would have forced this inference from *Austins* Opinion of absolute Predestination: If Gods decree be absolute, *Nemo vigilet, nemo jejunet, nemo libidini contradicat, &c.* The Papists say, It follows, That if we be justified by Faith onely, then we need not do good works. The Remonstrants and their followers say [a], That if a Believer cannot fall from Grace, then need he not fear to commit any sin whatsoever. Nor do these Consequences flow any whit more naturally from our Tenent, then they do from these. Doth it follow, That because all the Elect are by means of Christs death, actually reconciled unto God, and freed from the condemnation of the Law, That therefore men may live as they list, that they need not hear, believe, and obey the Gospel? How doth this sow pillows under mens elbows, or lull asleep in security, more then the Doctrine of absolute Election? Seeing as all men are not elected, so neither are all men reconciled unto God; nor can any man know, That he is elected and reconciled unto God, but by, and thorow Faith; which Faith is wrought in men by the Preaching of the Word, and doth certainly produce a holy life [b].

Faustus Riegi ensis.

[a] See S. G. his Animadversions on Love Speech.

[b] *Justificatus per fidem, non potest nisi dilectione justè operari*, Aug. Let a Believer sin if he can, *Preston N. C. p. 361.*

§. 7. I confess, I am yet to seek of the Reason of his other Deduction, That this Assertion of actual reconciliation before Faith, overthrows the comfort of true Believers, and destroyes the ground, nature, use, and end of Faith. Is it an uncomfortable Doctrine to tell men, That we are not sharers with Christ in effecting of our peace with God, and in procuring the pardon of our sins; and that Christ hath finished this work before we knew it? Is it not much more comfortable to poor souls, that Christ hath absolutely, and by himself obtained forgiveness for sinners, then that he hath procured this Grace but conditionally, upon condition we perform such and such works, for which we have no strength or ability in our selves? Whence have the Saints drawn all their comfort? Surely, not from Faith, or any other work of theirs, but by Faith from Christ, and from the perfection and al-sufficiency of his Sacrifice: Not onely the Protestants, but the Papists themselves

(though in the Schools they contend for the dignity and congruity of works, that they are Moral causes, or necessary conditions of Justification and Salvation; yet on their death beds, they utterly renounce them, they) exhort men in distress of Conscience, to roul themselves wholly upon Jesus Christ. In a form prescribed for visiting of the sick, the Priest or Minister was enjoyned to put these Questions to the sick party [c]. *Dost thou believe to come to glory, not by thy own merits, but by the vertue and merit of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ? And dost thou believe, That our Lord Jesus Christ did die for our salvation, and that none can be saved by his own merits, or by any other means, but by the merit of his passion?* Whereunto, when the sick person answered affirmatively, I do believe it; the Priest is bid to exhort him, in this wise, *Go to therefore, as long as thy soul remaineth in thee, place thy whole confidence in his death onely, have confidence in no other thing; commit thy self wholly to his death, with this alone cover thy self wholly, intermingle thy self wholly, wrap thy whole self in his death, &c. Dangerous* (saith *Bernard* [d]) *is the habitation of those that trust in their own works*: And in another place [e], *Ibi tuta, &c. What safe rest or security can the weak soul finde, but in the wounds of his Saviour? As he is mighty to save, so dwell I there with most safety. Parisiensis* in his Book of *Divine Rhetorick*, *Thou must beware* (saith he) *in thy striving with God, that thou dost not build upon a weak foundation, which he doth, that trusts in his own works. Gerson* often inculcates this [f], *That before the tribunal of God, we must onely plead the merits of Christ*: Bishop *Gardner* [g], though he would not have this gap to be opened to the people, yet he acknowledged it to be the *most comfortable Doctrine to such as were in his condition*, he being then on his death bed: Which is the more to be observed, because in his life time, he had stickled so much for our Adversaries Conditional Justification [h]. *Bellarmine* himself [i], when he had written divers Books for Justification by Inherent Righteousness, in the end concludes, *That for fear of vain-glory, and by reason of the uncertainty of our own works*, Tutissimum est, &c. *It is the safest way to place all our trust in the Mercy of God, and of Jesus Christ*; so that we may say as *Moses*, *Their rock is not*

as

[c] *Vid.* Bishop Fishers answer to the Jesuite, p. 568.
[d] In lib. de Succes. eccles. p. 194.
[e] Serm. in Psal. qui habitat. Ser. 1.
[f] *Ibi tuta firmaque infirmis securitas & requies nisi in vulneribus salvatoris? Tanto illic securior habito, quanto ille potentior ad salvandum*, in Cant. Ser. 61.
[f] Part. 1. Serm. de nuptiis Christi. Tract. de distinct. visions. part. 2. de verbo Dom. & part. 3. de Consolat. Theolog.
[g] Foxes Acts & Monuments, Vol. 2. p. 2. Vol. p. 525.
[h] *Bellar.* l. 5. de Justif. c. 7.

as our rock, our Enemies themselves being Judges, Deut. 32. 31.

§. 8. Mr. *Cr.* hath not the least reason to charge us with destroying the Ground of Faith; for the Ground of Faith is either *Fundamentum Quod*, or *Fundamentum Quo*. Material and Personal, or else Doctrinal and Ministerial. We say with all true Christians, That the onely Material or Personal Foundation whereupon a poor soul can build securely for Life and Justification, is Jesus Christ[i]. Now the Doctrinal Foundation whereby our Faith is united to the former, we affirm with *Calvin*[k] (and many more), that it is, *Gratuita misericordiæ in Christo promissio, The free promise of Mercy*; in opposition to those Conditional Promises which send men partly to Christ, and partly to their own works; and therefore our Adversaries are much more obnoxious to this Censure, of *Destroying the Ground of Faith*, who allow it no other support, then Conditional Promises, whereby mens hope and confidence is made to lean more upon themselves, then it doth on Christ; much more upon their own works, then it doth upon his Righteousness. The forementioned Author[l] hath well observed, That if our Faith doth relie never so little upon our own works, it cannot possibly stand fast; that soul will never attain to any setled assurance of his Salvation, that builds his Faith upon such a sandy foundation.

[i] 1 Cor. 3. 11. *Certum, proprium que fidei fundamentum Christus est.* Aug. Enchirid c. 5.

[k] Instit. l. 3. c. 2. sect. 7. & 19. Opusc. 318.

[l] *Si quantulacunque portio in operâ nostrâ confidatur, cætera vacillabit fides.* Cal. Opusc. p. 280. *Fidei nulla erit certitudo, si operibus nitatur salus hominum.* Ib. p. 282. *In hunc modum si distrahatur salutis fiducia, nihil poterit, quàm vacillare; quid hoc aliud est quàm subvertere ab imo fundamentum?* Ib. p. 317.

§. 9. The nature of Faith receives not the least prejudice by our Doctrine; for if we define it (as most of our old Protestant Divines[m] have done) *Certa & indubitata persuasio*; A firm and certain perswasion of the favor of God, and the pardon of our sins, it confirms our Tenent; for mens sins must be pardoned before they can believe it, or else of necessity they must believe a lie. All men know that the object doth precede the act, unless it be when the act gives a being to the object: Or if we make it to be *fiducia*, the trust or reliance of the soul upon Jesus Christ, it receives no small encouragement from this consideration, That Christ hath finished whatsoever was necessary by Divine appointment, for the Justification of sinners, not expecting the least condition to be performed by us for that end: Our Faith is never so impregnable, as when it rests entirely upon Jesus Christ. And as for the ends and uses of Faith (which are cheifly to give us bold-

[m] *Melanæthon, P. Martyr, Calvin, Perkins, &c.*

neſs, and confidence towards God; to purifie our hearts, and to work by love, &c.) They are all of them promoted and furthered by the Doctrine we teach; for what is it, that gives us boldneſs towards God, but the merit and perfection of Chriſts ſacrifice? whereby the mouth of the Law is ſtopped, the accuſations of Satan are all anſwered, and the juſtice of God is fully ſatisfied. Again, What other means is there ſo effectual, to purifie our hearts, to conſtrain us to love him, &c. as the freeneſs, abſoluteneſs and immutability of his love to us; who whileſt we were ſinners, and enemies, reconciled us to himſelf by the Blood of the Croſs, and blotted out our ſins, as if they had never been committed?

§. 10. Mr. *Cr.* cenſure of *Curcellæus's* Opinion, is juſt and ſeaſonable, who judgeth theſe Differences amongſt Chriſtians about Juſtification to be of *ſo ſmall concernment, that they ought not to breed a controverſie*: For ſurely they are none of thoſe fooliſh queſtions and ſtrivings, which we are bid to avoid; if there be any point in the whole Doctrine of Godlineſs, for which we ought ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι, (as Saint *Jude* ſpeaks) *to contend earneſtly*. This challengeth our utmoſt zeal for the maintenance of it; ſeeing the glory of Gods Grace, the dignity of Chriſts Blood, and the comfort of our own ſouls lies at ſtake in the iſſues of it; our life, peace, and everlaſting Salvation is concerned herein: There is no truth that the Apoſtle doth ſo frequently preſs, and ſo earneſtly contend for, as this Article of our Free Juſtification; That no works of ours do concur to the procuring of it. Mr. *Calvin* hath obſerved, That if we were accorded with the Church of *Rome*, in all other points, ſave in this one particular, the diſtance between them and us is ſo great, That it is impoſſible we ſhould ever be reconciled: And I muſt needs ſay, That I ſee no material difference, between them and our Adverſaries, about this matter.

De Reform. Eccleſ. ad Interim.

§. 11. Mr. *Cr.* in the cloſe of his Prefatory Diſcourſe, tells the Reader, *Thou art beholding to the Learned Author for the penning of this Tract; but for the publiſhing of it to another.* And Mr. *W.* hath framed it in the form of a Letter to a private Friend, that the Reader might gueſs, he had no hand at all in publiſhing of it; whereas a near Kinſman of his, aſſured me, That Mr. *W.* in a Letter to himſelf, had confeſſed that his Sermon came abroad by his own appointment; which I do the rather believe, knowing

knowing his relation to the *Stationer*, for whom it was Printed. However I am glad, that it is made publick, that this point may be the better cleared by a deliberate examination of the utmoſt that can be ſaid againſt it; onely I wiſh, that this task had lighted upon ſome other man, who hath more leiſure, and better abilities to undertake it; that ſo precious a truth might not ſuffer, through the unskilfulneſs of a feeble Advocate. How much the Reader is beholding to Mr. *W.* for Penning or Printing of his Sermon, will appear in the iſſue of this debate.

CHAP. V.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *Introduction, Text, Doctrine, and Proofs, are briefly conſidered.*

HAving paſſed Mr. *Woodbridges* Out-works, we ſhall now proceed to ſurvey the Fort it ſelf, which (in his own conceit) is built ſo impregnable, *That nothing conſiſtent with the Scriptures, can be brought againſt it.* How ever, I am not diſcouraged from attempting it, knowing, That ſtrong holds more unlikely to be vanquiſhed, have been laid flat and level with the ground, *Lam.* 4. 12. 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5.

In his *Preface*, he tells the worthy Sir, to whom he communicated his Notes, *That he will not trouble him with his Introduction to the Text; or the Applicatory part of his Sermon.* It was very little that he ſpake in either; but I well remember, that he began and concluded with a great miſtake. In his Introduction he told us, that the ſcope of this Epiſtle was to prove, That we are juſtified by Faith, *i. e.* (as he explained it) That we are not juſtified in the ſight of God, before we believe; and that Faith is the condition on our part to qualifie us for Juſtification; whereas the ſcope of the Apoſtle (as ſhall be ſhewn more largely hereafter) was not to aſſert the time of our Juſtification, but the matter of it; he intended not to ſhew when, but wherewith we are juſtified; to wit, not by Works, or Righteouſneſs in us, but by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt freely imputed to us; which we apprehend,

apprehend, and apply by Faith [a]. By taking Faith in a proper sense, as a condition required on our part, he accuseth the Apostle of Self-contradiction; who all along denies, That we are justified by works; seeing Faith considered as a condition, is a work of ours, no less then love.

[a] *Calv.* de vera Pacif. p. 317.

In that part of his Application, where he addressed himself to unbelievers, he told them, That Christ was not a High Priest or Advocate to them, and that they had no Court of Mercy to appeal unto; which was all one, as if he had said, Christ did not die for them; and that they had no more ground to believe in him, then the Devils themselves; and consequently that their case was desperate and irrecoverable, though final unbelievers have not Christ for their High Priest; for he neither died, nor prayed for them, *Joh.* 17.9. Yet he performed both acts of his Priesthood, *scil.* Oblation and Intercession, for all that were given him by the Father, long before the Conversion of many of them. He laid down his life, not onely for those sheep that were called, but for those also that were not then gathered into his fold, *Joh.*10.15,16. And in the seventeenth of *John*, he says expressly, That he prayed not onely for them that did believe, but for them also that should believe in him. *Vers.* 20. Though it be true, That Christ shed not his Blood for Reprobates, yet we know not who are reprobated, until it shall be made manifest by their final unbelief. Indeed, we cannot say to an unbeliever, That Christ did die for him; and we have as little reason to say, That Christ did not die for him, seeing the Word doth reveal neither; and by affirming the latter, we do quite bar up the door of Hope, which ought to be held open to the worst of sinners. Our duty is to declare, That Christ is come into the world to save sinners, and to exhort all men every where to believe him. We were as good bid the Devils to believe, as those for whom Christ is not a High Priest; it is in vain for any to believe in Christ, if he never prayed, nor offered up himself a Sacrifice unto God for them; but seeing Mr. *W.* hath not troubled his Friend with these passages, I shall not trouble the Reader any longer about them.

§. 2. *That the Saints, or true Believers* (under which notion he writes to the *Romans* [b]) *are justified by Faith*; We do readily yeeld it to be a truth, it being *in terminis* in the Text. I dare say,

[b] See Chap. 1.7.

no

no man that is called a Christian, did ever deny it; and therefore he might have spared his pains in transcribing any more places of Scripture for confirmation of it. But I do much marvel, That so learned a man as Mr. *W.* who pretends to be more then ordinarily accurate, should take in hand a controverted Text, and never open the Terms, nor state the Question which he meant to handle; for though it be a sinful curiosity for men by *Dicotomies* and *Tricotomies*, *Divisions* and *Subdivisions*, to mince and crumble the Scriptures, till it hath lost the sense; yet surely, *a workman that needs not to be ashamed, ought rightly to divide* [c] *the Word of Truth*, explain things that are obscure and dubious; and where divers senses are given (as he knows there are of this Text) to disprove the false, and confirm that which he conceives is true.

[c] 2 Tim. 2. 15. ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον quasi dic. Bez. in loc. *Full. Miscel.* sac. l. 3. c. 16.

§. 3. There is a vaste distance between the Apostles Proposition [*a man is justified by Faith,*] and Mr. *Woodbridges* Inference, *Ergo*, Justification doth in no sence precede Faith. Justification by Faith, and Justification before Faith, are not *opposita*, but *diversa*; though they differ, yet they are not contradictory to each other: The Scriptures which prove the former, intend no strife, or quarrel against the latter; in a word, The proof of the one, doth not disprove the other. The Scripture which he made his theam, *Rom.* 5. 1. *Therefore being justified by Faith, we have peace with God, &c*, concludes nothing at all against Justification before Faith; For (1) we may without any violence to the Text, place the Comma after *justified*, (as thus) *Being justified, by Faith we have peace with God:* This reading is agreeable both to the Apostles scope, and to the Context. His scope here was not to shew the efficacy of Faith in our Justification, but what benefits we have by the death of Christ [d]; the first of which is Justification, and the consequent thereof is peace with God. Again, the Illative Particle (*Therefore*) shews, that this place is a Corollary, or Deduction from the words immediately foregoing, which ascribed our Justification wholly to the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, *Chap.* 4 *ult.* The Apostle thence infers, Being justified *q.d.* Seeing we are justified freely, without works, by the death of Christ, by Faith we have peace with God; the Lord powerfully drawing our hearts to believe this, we have boldness and confidence towards God, the cause of fear being taken away; or

[d] *Willet.* in Rom. 5. p. 235. *Paræus.* Ib. *prima efficacia mortis Christi est justificatio, &c.*

as the *Syriack* and vulgar *Latin* read it, *Let us have peace with God*; let us by Faith improve this Grace, for the eſtabliſhing of our hearts in perfect peace. Now according to this reading, his own Text will give in evidence againſt him, That Faith is not the cauſe or antecedent, but an effect and conſequent of our Juſtification, procured and obtained by the death of Chriſt. But (2) if we take the words, as commonly they are read, the ſence comes all to one, *ſcil.* That being juſtified by Chriſt (who is the ſole object of our Faith) we have peace with God; who by the Faith which he creates in us, cauſeth us to enjoy this reconciliation; by vertue whereof, our Conſcience is ſo firmly grounded, that we are not moved by any temptation, or beaten down by any terror[e]. The Work of Faith is not to procure our Juſtification, but to beget peace in our Conſciences. So then, the words being rightly underſtood, they neither deny Juſtification before Faith, nor aſſert Juſtification by the act or habit of Faith, which Mr. *W.* would conclude from thence.

[e] *Diodat.* in loc.

§. 4. The next Scripture, whoſe ſuffrage is deſired againſt us, is *Gal.* 2. 16. *We have believed in Chriſt, that we might be juſtified by the Faith of Chriſt.* Where (ſayes Mr. *W.*) Juſtification is expreſly made a Conſequent of Faith. To which I Anſwer (1) That this doth no more infer, That we are not juſtified before we believe, then that of our Saviour, *Matth.* 5. 44, 45. *Love your enemies,* &c. *that ye may be the children of your Father in Heaven*, infers, That works do go before adoption, contrary to *Eph.* 1. 5, 6. 1 *Joh.* 3. 3. the phraſe [*that ye may be*] there, is as much, as that ye may be manifeſted and declared; that ye may ſhew your ſelves; [f] or, that all men may know, that ye are the children of God, by practiſing a duty ſo much above the reach of Nature and Morality. A like place we have, *Rom.* 3. 26. *God ſet forth his Son to declare his Righteouſneſs, that he might be juſt.* Now ſhall we hence infer, That God was not juſt before? or that Gods juſtice was a conſequent of his ſending Chriſt? Now if we can underſtand that clauſe, [*that he might be juſt*] That he might be known, and acknowledged to be juſt: Why may we not as well take this of the Apoſtle, [*that we might be juſtified*] in the ſame conſtruction, that we might know that we are juſtified, and live in the comfort and enjoyment of it: So that,

1 Pet. 2. 9.

[f] *Diodat.* on Matth. 5. 45.

[g] *Ut ſe ſanctum & juſtum declararet, ſeu ut gloriam juſtitiæ illuſtraret.* Par in loc.

not

not the Being of our Justification, but the Knowledge and Feeling of it, is a consequent of Faith. Things in Scripture are then said to be, when they are known to be; so *John* 15. 8. our Saviour tells the Disciples, *That if they did bear much fruit, they should be his Disciples, i. e.* They should be known and manifested to be his Disciples, as *Chap.* 13. 35. Our Saviour is said at his Resurrection, to have become the Son of God, *Acts* 13. 33. Because, *then* (as the Apostle speaks) *he was powerfully declared to be the Son of God, Rom.* 1. 3. Again, things are said not to be, which do not appear, as *Melchisedec* is said to be without Father and Mother, *&c. Heb.* 7. 3. Because his Linage and Pedigree, is not known; so we are said to be justified, or not justified, according as this Grace is revealed to us. But (2) in the Text it is, *We have believed, that we might be justified by Faith*; so that from hence it can be inferred onely, That we are not justified by Faith, before believing; and that the sentence of Justification is not terminated in our Consciences, before we do believe.

§. 5. His next Proof is grounded upon the order of the words, *Rom.* 8. 30. *As glory* (saith he) *follows Justification, so doth Justification follow Vocation unto Faith.* Whereunto I answer, (1) That the order of words in Scripture, do not shew the order and dependance of the things themselves: The Jews have a Proverb, *Non esse prius aut posterius in Scriptura* [h]. The first and last must not be strictly urged in Scripture; for that is not always set first, which is first in Nature: If we should reason from the order of words in Scripture, we should make many absurdities [i], as 1 *Sam.* 6. 14. *It is said that they clave the Wood of the Cart, and offered the Kine for a burnt offering unto the Lord:* And then in the next Verse it follows, That the *Levites* took down the Ark out of the Cart; as if they had clave the Cart before the Ark was taken down, which could not be. In 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. it is said, *God hath saved us, and called us*; yet I suppose Mr. *W.* will not say, That men are saved, before they are called. So though Vocation be set before Justification, yet it doth not follow, that it precedes it in order of Nature. (2) The Apostles scope here, is not to shew in what order these Benefits are bestowed upon us, but how inseparably they are linked unto our Predestination;

[h] *Salom. Jarchi in Gen.* 6. 3.

[i] See *Babing. on Gen.* 4. 1.

and that it is impoſſible, either ſin or affliction ſhould make them miſerable, whom God hath choſen. (3) I ſee no inconvenience at all, in ſaying, That the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of Juſtification, as it is declared and terminated in our Conſciences, which ſome learned men[k] do make the *formale* of Juſtification; and in this reſpect, I ſhall grant him, That Juſtification is a conſequent of Vocation.

[k] Mr. *Owen.* Mr. *Kendal* againſt *Goodwin*, cap 4. p. 138. 145.

§. 6. Mr. *Woodbridges* next Allegation is from *Rom.* 4. 24. *Righteouſneſs ſhall be imputed to us, if we believe. Ergo.* It was not imputed before we did believe. I anſwer, That the conſequence is not neceſſary[l]; for this Particle (*if*) is uſed ſometimes declaratively: It doth not always propound the condition, by which a benefit is obtained, but ſometimes it ſerves to deſcribe the perſon to whom the benefit doth belong[l]. Deſcriptions are taken from Effects and Conſequences, as well as from the Cauſes or Antecedent Conditions: As for inſtance, *If a man* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *purge himſelf from theſe, he ſhall be a veſſel unto honor*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 21. The Papiſts infer from hence, That a man is made a veſſel of honor, by purging himſelf, &c. Our Proteſtant Divines[m] do anſwer, That the place proves not, that a man is hereby made, or becomes a veſſel of honor, but that hereby he is manifeſted and known to be a veſſel of honor. So *Heb.* 3. 6. *Whoſe houſe are we, if we hold faſt our confidence, and the rejoycing of the hope firm unto the end.* Which we are not to underſtand, as if theſe things did make us to be the houſe of God, but that hereby we appear, and approve our ſelves to be the houſe of God[n]. This Conjunction (*if*[o]) is many times annexed unto the Marks and Cognizances of ſuch as ſhall be ſaved, or are happy, which do ſhew, *Non propter quid beandi ſunt, vel ſervandi, ſed quales beati ſunt, quales ſervandi.* Not upon what conditions, but what manner of perſons are finally ſaved. I ſee no reaſon, but it may be ſo underſtood in this place; his Righteouſneſs is imputed to us, if we believe, *q. d.* Hereby we may know, and be aſſured, that Chriſts Righteouſneſs is imputed to us, that we, whether Jews, or Gentiles, are the perſons to whom this grace belongs; if God hath drawn our hearts to believe, and obey the Goſpel; in regard that none do, or can believe, but ſuch *as are ordained to life* P, and to *obtain ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt.* The Lord works Faith in

[l] See Mr. *Walkers* Socinianiſm Diſcovered, p. 224.

[m] D. *Sutcliff* on Rom. 11. p. 61.

[n] Dr. *Foxes* on the place.

[o] Dr. *Downh.* of Juſtif. l. 7. c. 4 ſect. 16. p. 473.

P Acts 13. 48. & 2. 47.

in none, but in them, to whom he hath imputed the Righteousness of his Son.

§. 7. The other Scriptures he hath brought, conclude as weakly against us, as any of the former, as *Acts* 10. 43. *Thorow his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins.* And *Acts* 26.18. *That they may receive forgiveness of sins---- who are sanctified by Faith*; with *Acts* 13. 39. *By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the Law of* Moses. *To which* (says Mr. *W.*) *might be added, multitudes of other places.* I confess his Concordance would have furnished him with many such places, but no more to the purpose, then these he hath cited; which though they affirm, That Believers are justified, yet they deny not the Justification of the Elect, before believing. In the former it is, *Whosoever believeth, shall receive remission of sins*; it is not, *By believing, we obtain remission of sins, or God doth not discount mens sins unto them, till they do believe.* The *giving* of remission, and the *receiving* of remission, are two things; the former is Gods act, who is the onely Justifier, the latter is ours; the former is properly Justification, and not the latter; though it be called so in a passive and improper sence. We know a Prince pardons a malefactor when he gives his consent, That the Sentence of the Law should be reversed, and confirms it with his Hand and Seal: This Pardon is valid in Law, and secures the offender from punishment, though it come not to his hands for a good while after. So a Father gives, and bequeaths an Estate to his Childe that is an Infant; which by the donation of the Father, belongs to the Childe, though the Childe do not receive, and enjoy it, till he comes to age. So *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their sins unto them*; Though no man doth receive and enjoy this Grace, till he doth believe; we obtain remission of sins by Christ alone, but we receive it by Faith.

§. 8. In the 13 of the *Acts* 39 the Apostle shews the excellency of the Gospel above the Law; or the priviledge of the Saints in the New Testament, above them that lived under the Old Administration; *Who* (saith he) *are justified from all things, &c.* There was a cleansing and purgation of sin provided in the Law, but not like unto that which is revealed in the Gospel. For (1) [q] Zech 13. 1.

the Law did not cleanſe them from all ſins, for ſome ſins it allowed of no Sacrifice at all; as for Blaſphemy, ſins of preſumption, &c. But now the Blood of that Sacrifice, which is exhibited in the Goſpel, cleanſeth us from all ſin, 1 *Joh.* 1.7. *Mark* 3.28. (2) Thoſe Sacrifices made them clean, but in an External Typical manner, as *To the purifying of the fleſh*, *Heb.* 9. 13. they could not *make them perfect, as pertaining to the Conſcience*, Heb. 10. 12. Whereas the cleanſing which is made by the Blood of Chriſt, is Spiritual and Internal, *It purgeth mens conſciences from dead works*, *Heb.* 9.14. They that are purged herewith, have *no more conſcience of ſin*, *de jure*, if not *de facto*, *Chap.* 10.2. They have *the anſwer of a good conſcience toward God*, *q. d.* They can plead not guilty, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. (3) The legal cleanſing was by Sacrifice after Sacrifice, *Heb.* 10. 3. Whereas Chriſt by one Sacrifice, once offered, hath taken away all the ſins of his people; or as it is in *Daniel*, hath made an end of ſin: So that here is nothing at all of the time of our Juſtification, though he affirms, That they that believe, are thus perfectly juſtified; yet it follows not from this, or any other Text, That the Elect are not juſtified, before they believe; and much leſs, That a man is juſtified by the gratious act or habit of Faith.

§. 9. Mr. *W. Pag.* 2. gives his Reader our Sence of theſe Scriptures. *The onely Anſwer* (ſaith he) *which is given to theſe, and the like Texts, is this, That by Juſtification we are to underſtand a Juſtification in the Court of Conſcience, or the Evidence and Declaration of a Juſtification already paſt before God: So that Faith is ſaid to juſtifie us, not becauſe it doth juſtifie us before God, but becauſe it doth declare to our Conſciences, that we are juſtified.* Now becauſe this report is very imperfect, I ſhall crave the patience of the Reader, whileſt I declare our Judgement a little more fully, concerning this Matter, together with the Grounds and Reaſons that do uphold it; and then I ſhall return to ſecure this Anſwer againſt the Exceptions Mr. *W.* hath made againſt it. But firſt, I ſhall ſhew the ſeveral Explications which Divines have given of his Propoſition [*A man is juſtified by Faith.*]

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The several Opinions of Divines, touching the meaning of this Position,

[*A man is justified by Faith.*]

THE Question depending between me, and Mr. *W.* is not, Whether we are justified by Faith? which the Scripture frequently affirms, and no man that I know, denies it; Papists and Protestants, Orthodox and Socinians, Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants, do unanimously consent, That we are justified by Faith. All the difference is, about the Sense and Meaning of this Proposition, *A man is justified by Faith.* Whether Faith therein, be to be taken Properly, or Tropically? For though there be great variety in Expression[a] amongst Divines, concerning this Matter, yet all their several Opinions and Explications may be reduced unto these two heads. The first takes Faith *in sensu proprio*, for the act, or habit of Faith; the other takes Faith *metonymicè & relativè*, for the object of Faith, (*i. e.*) The obedience and satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

[a] *Vid. Stegm. Phoin.* p. 739, &c.

§. 2. Our Protestant Divines (who have hitherto been counted Orthodox) do take *Faith* in this Proposition [*A man is justified by Faith*] in a Tropical and Figurative Sence; as thus, A man is justified in the sight of God, from all sin and punishment by *Faith*, *i.e.* By the Obedience and Righteousness of Jesus Christ, in whom we believe, and upon whom we relie for Life and Righteousness. Nor is this any unusual Trope, either in Scripture, or in other Authors, to put *Habitum, vel actum pro objecto*, as *Rom.* 8. 24. *Hope that is seen, is not hope*, *i. e.* The thing that is seen, is not hoped for. Christ is oftentimes called our Hope, our Joy, our Love, *&c.* because he is the object of these Acts and Affections; when the same thing is attributed distinctly, both to the act, and the object, it must needs be attributed to one, in a proper, and to the other, in an improper sence; and therefore (says Dr. *Downham*[b]),

[b]

[b] Of Juſt. l. 6. c. 15. ſect. 2. Ib. p. 415.

ham [b]) *When Juſtification is attributed to Faith, it cannot be attributed in the ſame ſence, as to the death and obedience of Chriſt in propriety of Speech; but of neceſſity it is to be underſtood by a Metonymy: Faith being put for the object of Faith,* * Vind. Fid. *which is the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, &c.* And holy *Pemble* *, *If we liſt not to be contentious, it is plain enough* (ſaith he) *that in thoſe places, where the Apoſtle treats of Juſtification by Faith, he means the Grace of God in Jeſus Chriſt, oppoſing Works and Faith; that is, the Law and the Goſpel, the Righteouſneſs of the Law, to the Righteouſneſs of the Goſpel, which is no other but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. Thus* (ſaith he) *Faith is taken, Gal. 3. 23. before Faith came. i. e.* Before Chriſt came, and the clear exhibition of his Righteouſneſs: And in this ſence (as another hath obſerved) it is uſed at leaſt thirteen times in this Chapter, where the Apoſtle expreſly treats of our Juſtification before God. [c] *Albertus Pighius*, though a Papiſt, was ſo far convinced of this truth, by reading of *Calvins* Inſtitutions, that he acknowledged, *If we ſpeak formally and properly, we are juſtified, neither by Faith nor Charity, but by the onely Righteouſneſs of Chriſt communicated to us, and by the onely mercy of God, forgiving our ſins.*

[c] De fide & Juſti. Cont. 2. fol. 47.

§. 3. Some of our Divines, who do utterly deny, That Faith in this Queſtion is taken *ſenſu proprio*, or that the τὸ *credere*, or act of believing is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs, do yet aſcribe an inſtrumentallity, or inferior cauſality unto Faith it ſelf, in our Juſtification before God. They ſay, That we are juſtified by Faith *inſtrumentally*, and *relatively*; which terms, I confeſs, ſound harſhly in my ears, but I hope, I ſhall be excuſed, if I do not underſtand them, ſeeing a far learneder man [d] then my ſelf, hath profeſſed, That they were *not very intelligible to him.* That Faith is taken relatively in this Queſtion of Juſtification, to wit, For the object, it relates unto; Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs, I do readily grant; but that it juſtifies us Relatively, I cannot aſſent to it; for it ſeems to me, to carry this ſence with it, either (1) that Faith doth procure our Juſtification, though not by its own worth and dignity, yet through the vertue, and merit of its object. As the Papiſts ſay of Works, That they do juſtifie and ſave us *tincta ſanguine Chriſti*, being dipped in the Blood of Chriſt: Or (2) that Faith, together

[d] Dr. *Hammonds* Letters to Dr. *Ch.* p. 120.

together with Christ its object, doth make us just in the sight of God; whereby it is made a social cause with the blood of Christ, which shall be sufficiently disproved anon. Again, that Faith is a passive Instrument of our Justification, to wit, such an Instrument whereby we receive and apply this benefit to our selves, was shewn before [c]; but that it is an active efficacious Instrument to make us just and righteous in the sight of God, is no part of my Creed. For 1. it seems to me a contradiction to say, That Faith is not to be taken *sensu proprio*, but *metonymicè*, for the object thereof, and yet say, That we are justified by Faith instrumentally; for it is not the object, but the act of Faith, which is an Instrument: Faith considered as an Instrument, is taken *sensu proprio*, and consequently the *credere*, which they disclaim, must be said to justifie. 2. Mr. *Baxter* [f] in my judgement disputes rationally against this notion. *If Faith* (saith he) *be the Instrument of our Justification, it is the Instrument either of God, or man; not of man, for Justification is Gods act, he is the sole Justifier.* Rom. 3. 26. *man doth not justifie himself; not of God, for it is not God that believeth.* To which I adde, that God neither needs, nor is capable of using an Instrument in the act of justifying; for though he useth Instruments to declare and reveal this Grace to sinners, yet not to will it to particular persons; the acts of his will are not wrought by any Organ, or Instrument, without himself. 3. By making Faith the Instrument of our Justification, Justification is made the Effect, and Faith the Cause; and so consequeatly, a man shall be said to justifie himself [g], whereas the Scripture every where ascribes our Justification unto God and Christ, making us totally passive in this work, *Rom.* 3. 24, 26. & 8. 33. *Eph.* 2. 8. We can no more justifie our selves, then raise our selves from the dead, *Eph.* 2. 1, 5. or then we could give our selves a being, when as yet we were not, *Vers* 10. Man is so far from being the total, or principal Cause of his Justification, that he is no cause at all; by ascribing the least causality, or efficiency to man, in his Justification, we derogate from the Grace of God in Jesus Christ.

[c] Cap. 4. sect. 3.

[f] Aphoril. 56. p. 219.

[g] See Mr. *Baxters* Append. p. 121.

§. 4. Others do take Faith in a proper sence, as the Papists, Socinians, and Remonstrants; amongst whom, though there be some difference in Expression, yet they all agree in this, That by

Faith in this Propoſition [*A man is juſtified by Faith*] is meant the act or habit of Faith, or ſuch a Faith as is accompanied with faithful Actions. The Papiſts ſay, That Faith, and other inherent Graces, though in their own nature they do not deſerve Juſtification, yet through the merits of Chriſt, and Gods gracious acceptance, they do procure and obtain the forgiveneſs of our ſins. Though they aſcribe a meritoriouſneſs to Faith, it is but in a qualified ſence. *Faith* (ſaith *Bellarmine*[h]) *doth but* Suo quidem modo mereri remiſſionem, *after a manner merit remiſſion, ſcil.* By vertue of Gods Promiſe and Covenant, who hath annexed forgiveneſs unto this condition. *If a King* (ſaith he) *doth promiſe a Beggar a thouſand pound a year upon no condition, then indeed the Beggar doth not deſerve it; but if it be upon condition, that he do ſome ſmall matter, as to come and fetch it, or to bring him a Poſie of flowers, then he doth deſerve it, becauſe the promiſor is bound unto performance:* And in this ſence Mr. *B.*[i] aſcribes a meritoriouſneſs to works. But the chief difference between them and us, lies in this: We ſay a man is juſtified by the imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs; they, That we are juſtified by inherent Righteouſneſs, or by doing of Righteous Actions, ſuch as are Faith, Love, Fear, *&c.* *Ipſa fides in Chriſtum* (ſaith *Bellarmine*[k]) *eſt juſtitia. Faith it ſelf is our righteouſneſs*; And that it doth juſtifie us, *impetrando, promerendo, & inchoando juſtificationem. Arminius*, and the *Remonſtrants*, though they have exploded the word *merit*, yet they attribute as much to Faith, and faithful Actions, as the Papiſts themſelves. *Dico* (ſaith *Arminius*[l]) *ipſum fidei actum, credere, imputari in juſtitiam, idque ſenſu proprio, non metonymicè.* The very ſame is affirmed by *Vorſtius*, *Bertius*, *Epiſcopius*, and the reſt of the Remonſtrants. Their Opinion in brief is this, That God in the Legal Covenant required the exact obedience of all his Commandments, but now in the Covenant of Grace he requires Faith, which in his gracious acceptation ſtands inſtead of that obedience to the Moral Law, which we ought to perform; *Which* (ſay they) *is procured by the merit of Chriſt, for whoſe ſake God accounts our imperfect faith, to be perfect Righteouſneſs.*

§. 5. Some of our late Divines (who ſeem to diſclaim the Doctrine of the Papiſts and Arminians) ſay the very ſame; who explain

[h] *Bellar.* de Juſt. l. 1. Quatuor ult. capit.

[i] Theſ. 26.

[k] De Juſtif. l. 1. c. 17.

[l] Ep ad Hip. pol. & Reſp. ad 31. Art. Art. 4.

explain themselves to this effect, *That Faith doth justifie as a condition, or antecedent qualification; by which we are made capable of being justified, according to the order and constitution of God: The fulfilling of which condition* (say they) *is our Evangelical Righteousness, whereby we are justified in the sight of God.* Mr. *B.* is so fond of this notion, That although in one place [m] he findes fault with the length of our Creeds and Confessions; yet he would have this made *an article of our Creed, a part of our Childrens Catechisms, and to be believed by every man that is a Christian* [n]; so apt are we to smile upon our own Babes. Though I honor Mr. *Baxter* for his excellent parts, yet I must suspend my assent to his new Creed. I shall prove anon [o], That Faith is not said to justifie, as an antecedent condition, which qualifies us for Justification; but at present, I shall onely render him the Reasons of my dislike. Why I cannot look upon Faith as that Evangelical Righteousness, by which we are justified. I shall not insist upon it, though it be not altogether unconsiderable, that this notion is guilty of too much confederacy, with the aforenamed enemies of the Christian Faith; for though it is no good Argument to say, That Papists, Socinians, *&c.* do hold this; or that, therefore it is not true; yet it will follow, That such and such Tenents have been held by Papists, *&c.* and unanimously opposed by our Protestant Writers; therefore they ought to be the more suspected, and especially such Tenents of theirs, as are the chief points in difference between us and them, as this is. Our Brethren that have started this notion, do take Faith, as the others do, in a proper sence, they attribute as much to the [p] *credere*, as *Bellarmine, Arminius*, or any other. *Faith it self* (says Mr. *B.*) *is our Righteousness.* There was never any Papist so absurd, as to say, That our Faith, Love, *&c.* are perfect Legal Righteousness, but that God *judicio misericordiæ, non justitiæ*, doth account and accept of it instead of perfect Righteousness. For my part I must confess, that I can see no difference between them, but in Expression. The Papists do acknowledge the satisfaction of Christ, and that he is the meritorious cause of our Justification [p]. They say indeed, *That we are not justified by the Righteousness of Christ imputed, but by a Righteousness inherent in us, or Righteous actions performed by us.* And what do our Brethren say less

[m] Epistle to the Reader before his Saints Rest, p. 7.
[n] Aphoris. The. 20. p. 109.
[o] Cap. 9.
[p] *Concil. Trident. Sess. 6. c. 7.*

leſs then this? But I ſhall not follow the Parallel, any further.

§. 6. The Reaſons which turn the Scales of my Judgement againſt this notion, *That our Faith, or Faithful Actions are that Evangelical Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified*, Are

1. If we are not juſtified by our own works, then our believing, *&c.* is not that Evangelical Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified; but we are not juſtified by our own works, *Ergo.* The Aſſumption is written with a Sun beam throughout the Scripture, *Tit.*3.5. *Not by works of Righteouſneſs, which we have done.* Rom.11.6. *If it be of Works, then were Grace no more Grace.* It is the cheif ſcope of the Apoſtle throughout this, and the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, to prove, That we are not juſtified by works. The ſequel of the Propoſition is as evident, Becauſe Faith, and Obedience to Goſpel Precepts, are our works. Ieſs man that believes and obeys, and not God, though we do them by his help and aſſiſtance, yet they are our acts or works; ſo that conſequently, we are not juſtified by them in the ſight of God. The Papiſts to elude the force of this Argument ſay: *That the minde of the Apoſtle was onely to exclude from Juſtification, works of Nature, and not of Grace; works which we our ſelves do, by our own ſtrength, without the help of Grace, and not thoſe works which we do by the aid of Grace.* But Mr. *Pemble* anſwers well; *This diſtinction of works done without grace, and works done by grace, was deviſed by one that had neither wit nor grace, being a mean trick to elude the force of ſuch Scriptures, as do indefinitely exclude all works from our Juſtification, without diſtinguiſhing, either of the time when they are done, whether before or after; or of the aid and help whereby they are done; whether by Nature, or by Grace.* Others ſay, that when the Apoſtle denies, *That we are juſtified by works, he means that we are not juſtified by the works of the Law; but yet by works required in the Goſpel, ſuch as are Faith and Faithful actions, we may be juſtified.* To which I anſwer, (1) That the Apoſtle ſpeaks indefinitely; now the rule is, *Non eſt diſtinguendum ubi Lex non diſtinguit:* An indefinite Propoſition is equivalent to a univerſal. A man is not juſtified by works, is as much as if he had ſaid, A

Vind. Fid. 37.

man

man is not justified by *any* works of his own. (2) The Apostle excludes all works from our Justification, which do make the reward to be a due debt, *Rom.* 4. 4, 5. Now the works required in the Gospel (supposing it to be a Conditional Covenant) when they are performed, do make the thing covenanted a due debt, which the promiser is bound to give, no less then works required in the Law. (3) He denies expresly, that *Abraham* was justified by faithful actions, which he performed by the help and assistance of Gods Spirit, *Rom* 4. 2. (4) They are the same works for the substance, which are commanded in the Law and the Gospel; there is no Precept enjoyned us in the New Testament, which is not also commanded us in the Moral Law; though the Law doth not expresly command us to believe in Christ, yet virtually, and by consequence it doth: The Law requires us to believe whatsoever God shall reveal, or propose to us to be believed; and consequently to believe in Christ when God in his Gospel shall reveal him to us. There is no reason therefore to interpret this Proposition [*A man is not justified by works*] He is not justified by Legal, but by Evangelical works, seeing they are for substance one and the same. (5) There would be no such opposition between Justification by Works, and Justification by Faith, as the Apostle makes, if we were justified by Evangelical works of our own performing. All this disputing about Justification would amount but to meer Logomachy, or strife of words; for there was never any man so sottish, as to think, that a sinner can be justified by Legal works, unless the Law be mitigated, and the rigor thereof be in part remitted. The Apostle doth not dispute against Justification by works, which we cannot perform; but by works, which men presume they are able to perform: He excludes not onely perfect works, but all manner of works that are wrought by us.

6. 7. 2. If the Righteousness whereby we are justified, be a perfect Righteousness, then we are not justified by our Obedience to Gospel precepts. But the Righteousness whereby we are justified, is a perfect Righteousness, *Ergo.* The Sequel is evident, because our Obedience to Gospel precepts is imperfect and defective, at least in degrees; we do not believe, love, and obey so perfectly as we ought, the best of us may say with him in the Gospel, *Lord I believe, help thou my unbelief, Mark* 9. 24. And when

we have done our utmost, that we are but *unprofitable servants*, *Luke* 17. 10. Now this imperfection and defect in our Faith, and other vertues being *defectus debiti in esse*, is sinful and culpable[r]; for which cause our Saviour oftentimes sharply reproved it, *Matth.* 6. 30. & 8. 26. & 14. 31. & 16. 8. &c. And we are oftentimes exhorted to increase our Faith, to abound in duties of Obedience, and to perfect holiness, *Luke* 17. 5. 1 *Thes.* 4. 1. 2 *Cor.* 7. 1. In this last place the Apostle hints, that the imperfection of our holiness ariseth from the filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and consequently it is a defiled, and sinful imperfection. The Assumption (that we are not justified by an imperfect righteousness) needs not, I suppose, any long proof; for surely, God will not account that for perfect justice, which is not so indeed; for as the Apostle sayes well, *The judgement of God is according to truth*, *Rom.* 2. 2. It is certain, God will not justifie any man without Righteousness; and it is as certain, That God will not account that to be perfect Righteousness, which is imperfect and sinful; to say, That God doth not account our imperfect holiness to be Righteousness *judicio justitiæ*, but onely *judicio misericordiæ*, is a meer shift, which serves but to set the attributes of God at variance between themselves, which in the Justification of a sinner *do kiss and embrace each other*, *Psal.* 85. 10. When God judgeth according to mercy, he judgeth according to truth; his merciful judgement is a just, and a righteous judgement; the mercy of God is shewn, not in accounting a sinner perfectly righteous as for that Righteousness, which is imperfect; but in accounting to him that Righteousness, which is not his own, the perfect Righteousness of the Mediator. In this judgement of God, Justice and Mercy do both meet; Justice, in that he will not justifie a sinner without a perfect Righteousness; Mercy, in that he will accept him for such a Righteousness, which is neither in him, nor performed by him, but by his surety the Lord Jesus Christ. Some of our Protestant Divines do call Inherent holiness, *Evangelical Righteousness*, in respect of the principle from whence it flows, A heart purified by Faith; and to distinguish it from that Legal Righteousness, which Reprobates and Unbelievers have attained to, being but the fruit of a Natural Conscience. I am sure it is no Protestant Doctrine, that Inherent Sanctification (which on all hands

[r] *Quamdiu augeri potest charitas, profectò illud quod minùs est, ex vitio est.* Aug. ep. 29. ad Hieron. *Peccatum est, cum charitas minor est quàm debet.* Id. lib. de perf. justif. ad 15.

is acknowledged to be imperfect and defective) is that Evangelical Righteousness, whereby we are justified in the sight of God; which must needs be such a Righteousness, as God himself sitting on the Throne of his Justice can finde no fault with at all, but doth present the person that hath it, just and perfect before Gods Tribunal.

3. If the Righteousness, whereby we are justified, be the *Righteousness of God*, then we are not justified by our Obedience to Gospel precepts; but the Righteousness whereby we are justified, is the Righteousness of God, *ergo*. The Sequel is clear, because our Obedience to Gospel precepts, is not that Righteousness which the Scripture calls the Righteousness of God. For though we receive it from God, it being the gift of his Grace, yet it is every where called ours; as *our Faith*, *Matth.* 9. 22. *Rom.* 1. 8. *Hab.* 2. 4. *Jam.* 2. 3. *our Charity*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 8, 24 1 *Cor.* 16. 24. *Philem.* v. 1, 7. *our Hope*, *Phil.* 1. 20. 1 *Thes.* 2. 19. *our good Works*, *Matth.* 5. 16. *Revel.* 2. 2. *our Patience*, *Luke* 21. 19. 2 *Thes.* 1. 4. *Revel.* 2. 2. & 3. 10. & 13. 10. *&c.* Now the Scripture doth not call these Inherent Graces ours, to exclude the Divine assistance in the working of them, as if they proceeded onely from our selves, the strength of Nature in us, or the towardliness of our own wills: The Jews who went about to establish their own Righteousness, or Justification by their own works, did not deny that these works are the gift of God; the Pharisee expressly acknowledgeth as much, therefore gives thanks unto God for them, *Luke* 18. 12. But they are called ours, because they are subjectively in us, and instrumentally wrought by us; and in opposition to the Righteousness of Christ, which is neither in us, nor performed by us; but is (as the Scripture rightly terms it) the Righteousness of God, not the Essential Righteousness of God, as *Osiander* supposed, but the Righteousness of our Mediator, God-man; which though it be Inherent in the Humane Nature, and performed by it, yet is it truly called the Righteousness of God, because is is the Righteousness of that Person, who is perfect God: And thus the blood by which we are redeemed, is called *The blood of God*, *Acts* 20. 28. Or which is all one, *The blood of the Son of God*, 1 *John* 1. 7. The life which was laid down for us, was *the life of God*, 1 *John* 3. 16. The death by which

Agebat gratias Deo, de sua justitia, proinde à Deo eam se habere credebat. Bel. de Justif. l. 1. c. 8.

which we are reconciled to God, is *the death of his Son*, Rom. 5. 10. The Obedience by which we are conſtituted juſt, Rom. 5. 19. is *The Obedience of the ſame Son of God*. See Gal. 4. 4, 5. Chriſts Mediatorial Righteouſneſs is called the Righteouſneſs of God, to ſhew the dignity, and perfection of it, it being the Righteouſneſs of ſo great a perſon, who is not onely Man, but God: And that we ſhould not think it to be any thing in us from God, it is ſometimes called *his blood*, Rom. 5. 9. ſometimes *his obedience*, Verſ. 19. By the imputation whereof *we are made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*, as he by the imputation of our ſins, *was made ſin for us**. And thus the godly learned, yea, and ſome of the Popiſh Doctors have expounded the Righteouſneſs of God, mentioned in the 1, 3, and 10 Chapters to the *Romans*, of Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs[t]; which, ſays *Cajetan*, is called the Righteouſneſs of God, *Quia eſt in Deo perſonaliter, tum quia eſt apud divinum tribunal vera juſtitia, ad differentiam juſtitiarum noſtrarum, quia apud divinum tribunal ſunt velut pannus menſtruatus, &c.* i. e. *Becauſe it is perſonally in God, as alſo, becauſe at Gods tribunal it is accounted Righteouſneſs, and to diſtinguiſh it from our Righteouſneſs, which in the ſight of God, is as filthy rags*. There is nothing more clear, then that our Obedience to Evangelical precepts, is not that Righteouſneſs of God the Scripture mentions; which is not inherent in us, but imputed to us, being without us in Chriſt, God-man. The Aſſumption, That the Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, is the Righteouſneſs of God, is undeniably proved from *Rom.* 1. 17. & 3. 21. & 10. 3. In which laſt place, the Apoſtle ſhews, there is ſuch an oppoſition betwixt Gods Righteouſneſs, and ours, in the point of Juſtification, That whoſoever ſeeks to be juſtified by his own Righteouſneſs, cannot be juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of God; and therefore he himſelf profeſſeth, that in the Queſtion of Juſtification he utterly renounceth his own righteouſneſs, deſiring to be found in Chriſts Righteouſneſs alone, *Phil.* 3. 9. This Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which is out of us in him, is properly called Evangelical Righteouſneſs, becauſe it is the matter, or ſubſtance of the whole Goſpel; the Goſpel doth reveal it, and not the Law. *Rom.* 1. 17. If the *ut credere*, or act of believing, were that Evangelical Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified, this Scripture would

* 2 Cor. 5. 21.

[t] See *Downh.* of Juſtif. p. 130.

would be guilty of a groſs Tautology, *The Righteouſneſs of God is revealed from Faith to Faith*; for then the meaning muſt be, our Evangelical Righteouſneſs is revealed from Evangelical Righteouſneſs to Evangelical Righteouſneſs, which is abſurd.

§. 9. 4. If we are not juſtified by two Righteouſneſſes, exiſting in two diſtinct ſubjects, then our Obedience to Goſpel precepts is not that Righteouſneſs, whereby we are juſtified: But we are not juſtified by two Righteouſneſſes exiſting in two diſtinct ſubjects. *Ergo.* The Sequel is manifeſt, in regard the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is inherent in him, and obedience to Goſpel precepts, is a Righteouſneſs inherent in us. The Scripture ſundry times declares, That we are juſtified by Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs, *Rom.*3.24. & 5.9,19. Now if we were likewiſe juſtified by our Obedience to Goſpel precepts, it would follow, That we are juſtified by two Righteouſneſſes exiſting in two diſtinct ſubjects. But this is gain-ſaid in the Aſſumption, which will be ſecured by this proof; If by Chriſts Righteouſneſs alone we are made perfectly juſt, and righteous in the ſight of God, then there is no other Righteouſneſs which concurs with his to our Juſtification: For what needs an addition to that which is perfect? But by Chriſts Righteouſneſs alone we are made perfectly juſt, and righteous in the ſight of God; as theſe, and many other Scriptures do witneſs, *Heb.*1.3. & 10.14. *Col.*1.22. & 2.10, 13. Again, if we are juſtified partly by Chriſts Righteouſneſs, and partly by our own, our Faith for Juſtification muſt relie partly upon Chriſt, and partly upon our ſelves. *Paul* might have deſired to be found in his own Righteouſneſs; But our faith and truſt for Juſtification, may not in any part relie upon our ſelves, *Jere.*17.5. *Phil.*3.3. *Gal.*5.2,3,4. The Adverſaries of Grace (as we ſhewed before) acknowledge, that it is the ſafeſt courſe to truſt and relie upon Chriſt alone, and to fetch the comfort of our Juſtification from his perfect Obedience *onely.*

§. 10. 5. That which overthrows the main difference, between the Law and the Goſpel, ought not be admitted; for the confounding of them will open an in-let to innumerable Errors; nay by this means the Goſpel it ſelf will become a meer cypher. The Apoſtle we ſee was exceeding careful to keep theſe Doctrines diſtinct each from other; and therefore throughout all his Writings he

still oppoſeth the Law and Grace, Works and Faith, our Righteouſneſs and Chriſts Righteouſneſs; inſtructing us thereby, how needful it is they ſhould be kept a ſunder. But the making our Obedience to Goſpel precepts, the Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, overthrows the main difference between the Law and the Goſpel. *Ergo.* For herein (as Biſhop *Downham* well obſerves [1]) ſtandeth the chief Agreement, and Difference between the Law, and the Goſpel; they agree in this, That unto Juſtification, both do require the perfect fulfilling of the Law; but herein they differ, That the Law requireth to Juſtification, a Righteouſneſs inherent in us, and perfect Obedience to be performed in our own perſons; the Goſpel reveals for our Juſtification the perfect Righteouſneſs of an other, even of Chriſt, which is accepted in their behalf, that do believe in him, as if it had been performed in their own perſons. Now if Faith, and new Obedience be that Evangelical Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, then doth the Goſpel alſo propound for our Juſtification, a Righteouſneſs inherent in us, and performed by us; and ſo conſequently there remains no material difference between the Law and Goſpel, eſpecially ſeeing the ſame duties are preſcribed in both. If any ſhall ſay, That the Goſpel precepts do not require ſuch exact and perfect Obedience, as thoſe in the Law, their Aſſertion will want a Proof; nay, theſe and ſuch like Scriptures, do prove it to be utterly falſe; 1 *John* 3.16. *Matth.* 5.44,45. 1 *Pet.* 1.15, 16. A defect in degrees is a ſin againſt the Goſpel, as well as againſt Legal precepts. To theſe I might adde all thoſe Arguments, which our Divines have uſed againſt Juſtification by Inherent Righteouſneſs; but this may ſuffice to ſhew, That Faith and Obedience to other Goſpel precepts, is not that Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified in the ſight of God.

[1] Of Juſtif. l. 1. c. 4. ſect 7.

§. 11. Now briefly my ſence of this Propoſition [*We are juſtified by Faith*] is no other, then that which hath been given by all our Ancient Proteſtant Divines, who take Faith herein, Objectively, not Properly, and explain themſelves to this effect. *We are juſtified from all ſin and death, by the ſatisfaction and obedience of Jeſus Chriſt; who is the ſole Object or Foundation of our Faith, or whoſe Righteouſneſs we receive and apply unto our ſelves by Faith.* Yet I ſay it doth not follow, That it was not applied to us by God; or that God did not impute Righteouſneſs,

Righteousness to us, before we had Faith: We that believe, are justified by the Righteousness of Christ; it is no good Consequence, *Ergo* We were not justified in the sight of God, before we did believe; but now that we may [illegible] *Speak the truth in love*, I shall give the Reader a clearer account of my Judgement, concerning this Matter, in the following Chapter.

CHAP. VII.

Wherein the Question about the time of our Justification is distinctly stated; and these two Propositions [*A man is justified before Faith*] *and* [*A man is justified by Faith*] *reconciled.*

THat we may avoid mistakes, I shall briefly declare, (1) What we do understand by Justification? (2) What, by being justified in the sight of God? And (3) when we are justified in the sight of God? As touching the first of these, It would be but [illegible], a needless expence of time, to enter upon a large discourse, concerning the signification of the word, and the difference between Justification and Sanctification. We all know, that Justification in general, is the making of one just and righteous: Now there are two ways, whereby a person is made or constituted righteous, *viz.* by Infusion, or by Imputation.

1. By Infusion, when the Habitual Qualities of Righteousness are wrought in a person, by any means whatsoever; and these habits are put forth in a universal and perfect Conformity to the rule of Righteousness: And thus no man was ever justified since the fall, for as the Apostle speaks, *Rom.* 3.10. *There is none righteous, no not one*; no man, whether regenerate or unregenerate, is righteous with Inherent Righteousness, neither his Internal Habits nor External Actions, are exactly commensurate to the rule of Righteousness; the Church acknowledgeth, that *her righteousnesses* (*i. e.* Her best, compleatest, and exactest Righteousness)

were as filthy rags, Isa.64.6. And the Apostle accounted his own Righteousness but loss and dung, in reference to his Justification, *Phil.3.8.*

2. By Imputation, or gracious Acceptation; as when God doth not account or charge a mans sins upon him, but accepts him as just and righteous, deals with him as a righteous person, or as if he had never sinned: This latter is that Justification which we are now treating of. God justifies a man, when he accounts and esteems him righteous.

§. 2. The next thing propounded was, What is meant by the sight of God? This phrase is variously used. (1) Sometimes it relates unto the thoughts or knowledge of God, as *Heb.4.13. All things are naked, and manifest in his sight. i. e.* God hath a clear and distinct knowledge of all things whatsoever: And thus a man is justified in the sight of God, when God knows and esteems him to be just and righteous. (2) The sight of God relates more peculiarly to his Legal justice; for although in *articulo providentia*, in the Doctrine of Divine Providence, Seeing and Knowing are all one, as *Job 28.24. He looketh to the ends of the Earth, and seeth under the whole Heaven. i. e.* He knows and takes notice of all things, both in Heaven and Earth; yet in *articulo justificationis*, in the Doctrine of Justification, they are constantly distinguished throughout the Scripture, and never promiscuously used the one for the other. God is never said, to cover, blot out, or wash away the sins of his people out of his knowledge, but out of his sight, *Levit.16.30. Psal.32.2.* and *Rom.4.2,7. Psal.51.9.* God sees their sins, for whom his Law is not satisfied, *Nehem.4.5.** In regard that his truth and justice doth oblige him to take notice of, and punish them for their sins. Again, He sees not their sins, for whom he hath received a full compensation; because it is contrary to justice to enter into judgement against a person, who either by himself, or surety, hath made satisfaction for his offence b. And in this respect God is said, not to see the sins of his people, which yet he knows to be in them; which doth not detract from his omniscience, but exceedingly magnifies his Justice, and that perfect atonement which Christ hath made in their behalf; so that all, that are cloathed with the Innocency, Righteousness, and Satisfaction of Christ, they

a *Ipsa justitia nostra ad examen justitiæ divinæ deducta, injustitia est, sordet in districtione judicis quod fulget in opinione operantis.* Greg. l.5. in 3. cap. Job.

* Jer.18.23.

b *Quod tegitur, non videtur, quod non videtur, non imputatur; quod non imputatur, non punietur:* Jeron. in Psal. 32. Vid. Aug. in Psal.32. *Si voluit tegere, noluit videre, &c.* See Mr. *Reynolds* his Similitude, Sup c.3. sect 6.

they are justified in the sight of God, viz. Divine Justice cannot charge them with any of their sins, nor inflict upon them the least of those punishments which their sins deserve; but contrariwise he beholds them, as persons perfectly righteous, and accordingly deals with them, as such who have no sin at all in his sight.

(3) A late Divine of singular worth [c], hath another Construction of this phrase, [*In the sight of God,*] who observes that the word [*sight*] though it be for the form active, yet for the substance of it, it is rather passive; and therefore it is not attributable to God, as it is to us, but in God it signifies his making of us to see; and we are said to be justified in his sight, when he makes it, as it were, evident to our sight, that we are justified. But with due respect to that learned man (whom I highly honor for his worthy Labors) I conceive this phrase must have some other meaning in this debate; for else, that distinction of Justification *in foro Dei, & in foro conscientiæ*, (which hath been made use of by all our Protestant Divines, and whereof there is great need in this present controversie,) would be but a meer Tautology; for though it be the same Justification, wherewith we are justified in the sight of God, and in the Court of Conscience; yet the terms are not equipollent and convertible, but do admit of distinct considerations: though he that is justified *in foro conscientiæ*, is also justified *in foro Dei*; yet every one that is justified *in foro Dei*, is not justified *in foro conscientiæ*.

[c] Mr. *Kendal* against *Goodwin*, cap. 4. p. 138.

§. 3. Now according to these several Senses which are given of this forementioned phrase, it will be easie to resolve the third Query, concerning the time of our Justification, when we were justified in the sight of God? 1. If we take it in this last Construction, I shall grant, That we are not justified in the sight of God, before we believe: We do not know, nor can we plead the benefits and comforts of this Blessed Priviledge until we do believe; it is *by Faith, that the Righteousness of God is revealed to us*; and it is *by his knowledge* (notitia sui,) *that Christ doth justifie us*; or inables us to plead, not guilty, to all the Indictments and Menaces of the Law. But 2. if we refer it to the justice of God, (which I conceive to be the most proper and genuine use of it) we were justified in the sight of God, when Christ exhibited, and God accepted the full satisfaction in his Blood, for all our sins; that ran-

Rom. 1. 17. Isai. 53. 11. 1 Pet. 3. 21.

Gal. 3. 13. 1 Joh. 1. 7. Col. 1. 22. Eph. 5. 27.

ſome of his ſet them, for whom he died, free from the Curſe of the Law, cleanſed them from all their ſins, and preſented them holy, blameleſs, and unreproveable in the ſight of God; ſo that the eye of Divine Juſtice cannot behold in them the leaſt ſpot of ſin. This perfect cleanſing, is the ſole and immediate effect of the death of Chriſt, in regard that no other cauſe concurs therewith, in producing of it. 3. If we refer it to the knowledge of God, we were juſtified in his ſight, when he willed or determined in himſelf, not to impute to us our ſins, or to inflict thoſe puniſhments upon us, which our ſins deſerve; but contrariwiſe to deal with us as righteous perſons, having given us the Righteouſneſs of his own Son. God doth certainly know whatſoever he wills: Now God having from all eternity, abſolutely and immutably willed the Righteouſneſs of his Son to all his Elect; he ſaw, or knew them to be righteous in his Righteouſneſs, even when he willed it.

§. 4. For the clearer underſtanding of the Point in queſtion, I ſhall give in my Judgement concerning it, as diſtinctly as I can, in three Propoſitions.

Propoſ. 1. [d] *Faxeamur ergò neceſſe eſt, juſtificationis nomen variè ſumi, niſi velimus exiſtimare Apoſtolos à ſe diſſentire, & pugnantia enunciare, &c.* Whit. Cont. 1. q. c. 9.

The firſt ſhall be this, That Juſtification is taken variouſly in the Scripture [d], but more eſpecially, *Provolitione divina, & pro re volita*, (as the Schools do ſpeak.) (1) For the Will of God, not to puniſh, or impute ſin unto his people; and (2) for the effect of Gods Will, to wit, His not puniſhing, or his ſetting of them free from the Curſe of the Law. That Juſtification is put for the effect of Gods will, or the thing willed by that Internal Act, to wit, Our diſcharge from the Law, and deliverance from puniſhment, I ſuppoſe there is none will queſtion; the onely ſcruple that can ariſe, is, Whether the Will of God, not to puniſh, or charge ſin upon a perſon, is, or may be called Juſtification? I confeſs, to the end that I might not offend the weak [e], I have been ſparing of calling this immanent act of God, by the name of Juſtification, and the rather, becauſe ſome groſs miſtakes have ſought for ſhelter under the wings of this expreſſion. As (1) that abſurd conceit, That Chriſt came not to ſatisfie the juſtice, but onely to manifeſt the love of God; which yet hath not the leaſt countenance from our Doctrine, ſeeing that notwithſtanding the Will of God, not to puniſh his Elect, we ſay, That the Law muſt needs be ſatisfied for their ſins, no leſs then for the ſins of others. And (2) their

[e] *Facile eſt, imo & utile ut taceatur aliquod verum propter incapaces.* Aug. de perſever. Sanct. c. 15.

notion,

notion, who upon this ground have asserted the Eternal Being of the Creature, whereunto they were driven, because they could not answer that Consequence, *Justificatus est. Ergo Est*; which holds not *in terminis damnantis ibus*, whether *à priori*, as *Electus est. Ergo Est*; or *à posteriori*, *Mortuus est. Ergo Est*. Yet I must profess, That I look upon Dr. *Twisse* [f] his judgement in this point, as most accurate, who placeth *the very essence and quiddity of Justification in the Will of God not to punish*. Mr. *Kendal* [g], though he makes Justification to be a declared sentence, or transient act of God, yet he grants, *That Gods Will or Decree to remit our sins, carries in it a remission of them tam unum*; *for who shall charge them on us, if God decree to remit them?* And again, *This Decree hath so much of it that looks so well, like unto Justification, that it may be called so without Blasphemy*. But I see no inconvenience at all, but rather very much reason to adhere unto the Doctors definition, *That Justification is the will of God not to punish*. 1. Because the definition which the Holy Ghost gives us of Justification, is most properly applied to this act of God. It is a certain rule, *Definitum est, cui convenit definitio*; that is Justification, whereunto the definition of Justification doth agree. The definition which the *Psalmist*, and from him the Apostle gives of Justification, is Gods non-imputing of sin, and his imputing of righteousness unto a person, *Psal.* 32. 1, 2. *Rom.* 4. 6, 8. Now when God willeth not to punish a person, he doth not impute sin to him. The original words (both in the Old and New Testament) whereby imputation is signified, do make it more clear; for both of them do signifie an act of the minde or will: חשב (which is used by the *Psalmist*) is properly, to think, repute, esteem, or account [h], and the word λογιζομαι hath the same signification [i], it is usually applied to Accountants, who when they have cast up many sums, do set down at the foot, what they do amount unto: So when a man hath accounted with himself the loss and benefit, conveniencies, and inconveniencies that may accrue unto him, the result and issue of his deliberation, is significantly expressed by this word. it notes a stedfast purpose and resolution, *Quæ quasi rationibus subductis & explicata conclusa est*, it is opposed unto a doubtful and uncertain opinion. It notes either the purpose,

[f] *Remissio peccatorum si quidditaten inspiciamus nihil aliud est, quàm punitionis negatio, aut voluntatis punitendi negatio. Sit ergo peccata remittere nihil aliud, quàm nolle punire. Ad hoc nolle punire, ut actus immanens in Deo, fuit ab æterno.* Vind. Grat. l. 1. p. 2. sect. 25. & 1. in fol. p. 194.

[g] See *Kendals* Vind. c. 4. p. 134. & 145.

[h] Vid. *Pagn. Buxtorf.*

[i] Vid. Scap. Lex. ab Arithmeticis desumtur, &c. *Tartavinus.*

purpose, or determination of one alone, or the consent and agreement of two between themselves, whereof *Camerarius* [k] gives us an instance out of *Zenophon*. This word is fitly used to signifie this immanent act of God; for though he doth not purpose and resolve, in that manner as men do, by comparing things together; or by reasoning and concluding one thing out of another, yet are his purposes much more firm and immutable, *Mal.* 3. 6. *Jam.* 1. 17. *Numb.* 23. 19. The Lord therefore did non-impute sin to his people, when he purposed in himself, not to deal with them according to their sins, when the Father and the Son agreed, upon that sure and everlasting Covenant, That his Elect should not bear the punishment, which their sins would deserve. The Remonstrants [l] do acknowledge, That non-imputation, or remission of sin, is an immanent act in God, *Quam Deus in sua ipsius mente efficit.* We are commanded to forgive one another, as God hath forgiven us; now we know that our forgiveness is principally an act of the heart, As when a man purposeth in himself, not to take revenge, he doth then forgive. But of this, we shall have occasion to speak more largely in our Answer to Mr. *Woodbridges* first Argument.

[k] Comment. in Rom. 4. 4.

[l] In Apol. p. 212. *Nihil aliud est quàm voluntio aut decretum, &c.*

2. That which doth secure men from wrath, and whereby they are discharged and acquitted from their sins, is Justification; but by this immanent act of God, all the Elect are discharged and acquitted from their sins, and secured from wrath and destruction, *Ergo.* The Assumption onely will need to be proved, which is abundantly confirmed (1) by those places which make mention of Gods unspeakable Grace and Love towards them, from everlasting: For what is the Love of God, but his *velle dare bonum*; his fixed and immutable Will to bestow upon them the greatest good that they are capable of? Now, when God set his love upon them, *he said unto them, Live? Ezek.* 16. 6. This Will of God did secure them from death and destruction; it was a real discharge from condemnation, But (2) more plainly from the words of the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect.* The Proposition is either a Universal Negative, *No Elect person can be justly charged with sin*; or a Universal Affirmative, *All Elect persons are free from the charge of sin.* Which way soever we take, it is evident, That the Proposition

sition is Universal. Now if this priviledge did belong onely to Elect Believers (as some [m] would limit the Text) the Proposition were false; for though all true Believers are Elect persons, yet all the Elect are not Believers: It is as if one should say, *Omne animal* is *rationale*, and to excuse it, say, That by *omne animal*, he meant *omnis homo*; and to prove the Expression Legitimate, should alledge that *homo* is often called *animal*, which is true, but very impertinent to prove, that *omne animal* may be put for *omnis homo*.

[m] See *Burges* of Justif. p. 186.

§. 5. All that I have yet seen alledged against this Member of the distinction, That Gods will not to punish, is not Justification, is of little moment.

It is objected, 1. *That hereby Justification and Election are confounded.* *Object.* 1.

I answer, That it follows not, they may be both of them immanent, eternal Acts, and yet not confounded: For Election and Reprobation are eternal, immanent Acts, yet they are not confounded. Indeed, all different immanent acts, are but one simple act in God, in whose Decrees there is no Priority or Posteriority; seeing (as *Hilary* [*] speaks) *Omnia penès Deum æquabili æternitatis infinitate consistunt.* Yet in our consideration they receive sufficient distinction from their various Objects, and our various Application of them: And thus Election and Justification are distinguished. Election includes both the end, which is the glory of Gods Grace, and all the means from the beginning to the ending conducing thereunto. His will not to punish, includes precisely, and formally, onely some part of the means. *Answ.*

[*] De Trinit. l. 12.

2. It is objected, *That Justification imports a change of the persons state, to wit,* Ab injusto ad justum, *which cannot be attributed to the simple and unchangeable Decrees of God.* *Object.* 2.

I answer, That if Justification be taken for the thing willed, *viz.* The delivery of a sinner from the curse of the Law, then there is a great change made thereby; he that was a childe of wrath by Nature, hath peace and reconciliation with God. But if we take it for the Will of God, not to punish, then we say, Justification doth not suppose any such change; as if God had first a will to punish his Elect, but afterwards he altered his will to a will not to punish them. The change therefore of a persons state *ab in-* *Answ.*

justo ad justum ariseth from the Law; and the consideration of man in reference thereunto; by whose sentence the Transgressor is unjust; but being considered at the tribunal of Grace, and cloathed with the Righteousness of Christ, he is just and righteous; which is not properly a different state before God, but a different consideration of one and the same person. God may be said at the same time to look upon a person, both as sinful, and as righteous; as sinful, in reference to his state by nature, and as righteous, in reference to his state by Grace: Now this change being but imputed, not inherent, it supposeth not the being of the Creature, much less any inherent difference in the state of the Creature; no more then electing love, makes any inherent present change: Though the state of the loved, and hated, are different in the minde of God, yet not in the persons themselves, till the different effects of love and hatred are put forth.

Object. 3. 3. Others have objected, *That hereby we make void the death of Christ; for if Justification be an immanent act in God, it is Antecedent, not onely to Faith, but to the merits of Christ; which is contrary to many Scriptures, that do ascribe our Justification unto his blood, as the meritorious cause.*

Answ. To which I answer, That although Gods will not to punish, be Antecedent to the death of Christ; yet for all, we may be said to be justified in him, because the whole effect of that will, is by, and for the sake of Christ. As, though electing Love precede the consideration of Christ, *John* 3. 16. yet are we said to be chosen in him. *Eph.* 1. 4. because all the effects of that love, are given by, and through, and for him: Gods non-punishing of us, is the fruit of his death, yet his will, not to punish, is Antecedent thereunto.

Object. 4. 4. *Others say, we may as well call his will to create, Creation; and his will to call, Calling; and to glorifie, Glorification; as his will to justifie, Justification.*

Answ. We Answer, That there is not the same Reason for creating, calling, and glorifying; all which do import an Inherent change in the person created, called, glorified; which forgiveness doth not, it being perfect and compleat in the minde of God.

§. 6. These things being weighed in the ballances of an equal Judgment, I suppose the phrase would not sound so harsh, as it doth

to

to many; however, were the thing it self granted, That there was in God from Everlasting, an absolute fixed and immutable will, never to deal with his people according to their sins, but to deal with them as righteous persons; this Controversie were ended. For (1) Gods non-imputation of sin, to his Elect, is not purely Negative; as the non-imputation of sin unto a Stone, or other Creatures, which are not capable of sinning; but Privative, being the non-imputation of sin, *realiter futuri in esse*, as the imputation of Righteousness, is, *Justitia realiter futura in existentiâ*: The difference between these, is as great, as between a mans will, not to requite that debt, that shall, or is about to be contracted, and his will not to require any thing of one, that never did, nor will ow him any thing. (2) This non-imputation of sin, is actual, though the sin, not to be imputed, be not in actual being; in like manner, the imputation of Righteousness, is actual, though the Righteousness to be imputed, is not actual: Man whose thoughts arise *de novo*, doth non-impute, usually, after the commission of a fault; but for God (who is without any shadow of change and turning) so to do, is absolutely impossible; for as much as there cannot arise any new will, or new thought in the heart of God [n], (3) This act of justifying is compleat in it self, for God by his eternal and unchangeable Will, not imputing sin to his Elect, none can impute it; and he in like manner imputing Righteousness, none can hinder it. Neither doth this render the death of Christ useless, which is necessary by the Ordinance of God, as a meritorious cause of all the effects of this Justification; even as the eternal Love of God, is compleat in it self, but yet is Christ the meritorious cause of all the effects of it, *Eph.* 1. 3, 4. And therefore we say.

[n] See *Kendals* Vind. p. 134.

§. 7. 2. That if Justification be taken (as most commonly it is) not for the Will of God, but for the thing willed by this immanent act of his, to wit, Our discharge from the Law, and deliverance from punishment; so it hath for its adequate cause and principle, the death and satisfaction of Jesus Christ. Though there be no cause of the former out of God himself [o] (for the merits of Christ do not move God, to will, not to punish, or impute sin unto us) yet is Christ the meritorious cause of the latter. It is from the vertue of his Sacrifice, that the obligation of the Law

Propos. 2.

[o] *Nihil movet voluntatem Dei nisi bonitas sua.* Aquin. 1. p. q. 19. a. 2. ad 2. & art 5. in c.

is made void, and the punishments therein threatned, do not fall upon us. By his death he obtained in behalf of all the Elect, not a remote, possible, or conditional reconciliation, but an actual, absolute, and immediate reconciliation, as shall be proved anon P. Cap. 14. And in this respect, all that were given unto Christ by the Father, may be said to be justified at his death, not onely virtually, but formally; for the discharge of a debt, is formally the discharge of the debtor. Their discharge from the Law was not to be *sub termino*, or *in Diem*, but present and immediate, it being impossible that a debt should be discharged, and due at the same time. We acknowledge, That the effects of this discharge from the Law, may be said to be *sub termino*, or *in Diem*: As for instance, from that full satisfaction and perfect Righteousness, which Christ hath performed, there arise these two things. One is, The non-execution of the desert of sin (which we continually commit) upon us: That whereas the Reprobate sin, and upon their sin, the curse, with all the evils included in it, is upon them: The Elect likewise sinning, yet for Christs sake, the curse, or evil of suffering, is not inflicted upon them; which non-punishing *quoad effectum*, is forgiving, and not imputing sin: And in this sense, God is frequently said to forgive, when he doth not inflict punishment; and in this sense also, he is said often to forgive. The other is, The imputation of Righteousness, in the effects of it, whereby the effects of a true and perfect Righteousness come upon the people of God; to wit, All good things, both for this life, and that which is to come; yea, those things which seem to be evil, and hurtful (as their falls and afflictions,) are ordered by the over-ruling hand of a wise and powerful Providence, *to work together for good unto them*. These effects are immediate, in respect of causality, though not of time; for though God doth not presently bestow them, but as he sees fit, both for his own glory, and for their good; yet do they immediately flow from the merit of Christ, in regard there is no other meritorious cause, that intervenes and concurs therewith, in procuring of them. Notwithstanding we say, That our discharge from the Law must needs be immediate, and present, with the price or satisfaction that was paid for it, in regard, That it implies a contradiction, a debt should be paid, and discharged, and yet justly chargable. But of this we shall have occasion to speak more hereafter.

§. 8.

§. 8. 3. Justification is taken for the declared sentence of absolution and forgiveness: And thus God is said to justifie men, when he reveals, and makes known to them his Grace and Kindness within himself. And in this sense do most of our Divines take Justification, defining it, *The declared sence of absolution*; and not improperly: For in Scripture phrase, (as was noted before *) things are then said to be, when they are declared, and manifested; the declaring of things, is expressed in such wise, as if it made them to be; whereof many instances might be given; a very plain one there is, *Gen.* 41. 13. *Pharaohs* chief Butler, speaking of *Josephs* interpretation, *Me* (says he) *he restored, and him, i. e.* the Baker, *he hanged*; whereas he did but declare these successes unto them. So God is said to justifie his people, when he manifests and reveals to them that mercy and forgiveness, which before was hidden in his own heart, to wit, that he doth not impute their sins, but contrariwise, doth impute Righteousness unto them. *Propos.* 3.

* Cap. 5. sect. 4.

q *Non esse & non apparere, aequiparantur in jure.*

Now the Lord at sundry times, and divers ways hath, and doth declare, and manifest this precious Grace unto his people; (1) More Generally, towards all his Elect; and (2) more Particularly, to individuals, or numerical persons. The former is done, (1) in the Word of God; and (2) in his Works and Actions.

§. 9. First, God hath declared his immutable Will, not to impute sin to his people, in his Word: The Gospel, or New Covenant (being an absolute promise, as we shall shew anon,) may be fitly termed a Declarative Sentence of Absolution unto all the Elect, to whom alone it doth belong; the publication of the New Covenant is their Justification. For which cause *Maccovius* r makes Justification to Commence from the first promise, which was pronounced before the curse: So that if *Adam* had not been a publick person, including both the Elect and Reprobate, there had been no curse at all pronounced, save onely upon the Serpent, or Satan; in reference to this promise it was, that the Apostle saith, *The Grace of God, 2 Tim.* 1. 9. and *eternal life, Tit.* 1. 2. *was given to us*, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, which doth not signifie eternity, (as our Translators carry it) but the beginning of time; it is of the same latitude with ἀπ' ἀρχῆς 2 *Thes.* 2. 13. some learned

r Disp. 17. n. 22.

learned men[f] have observed, that the phrase is most properly rendered *ante tempora secularia, i. e. ante multa secula, vel sub initio seculorum*, to wit, in that famous promise of the womans seed, *Gen.*3.15. Now what was that Grace, and Life, which was given us in the beginning of times, but the Grace of Free Justification, whereby we are made to stand just and righteous in the sight of God? This Grace was revealed more clearly and distinctly in after ages, it shined brighter and brighter, till *the day spring from on high did visit us*[g]. Whose coming made it perfect day, in comparison whereof former times were obscure darkness, *Job.* 3.19. *Eph.*3.5. 2 *Cor.*3.18, *&c.* And therefore Grace and Life is peculiarly ascribed to the times of the New Testament, or the clear exhibition of the New Covenant at the coming of Jesus Christ, 2 *Tim.* 1.10. And the Gospel is said to cleanse and sanctifie men (*i. e.* to justifie them, or to purge them from an evil Conscience) *John* 15.3. *&* 17.17.

[f] Vid. *Mead in* Apoc. 14. 6. *Twiss.* Vind. gratt. l. 1. p. 1. c. 5.

[g] Luke. 1. 78.

§. 10. Secondly, God hath declared his gracious sentence of non-imputing sin, and imputing Righteousness unto his people in his Works and Actions, both towards Christ, and towards themselves: In his actions, or dealing with Jesus Christ, two ways. (1) In charging or transacting all their sins and iniquities upon him, *Isai.* 53.6. 2 *Cor.*5.21. 1 *Pet.*2.24. The Lord thereby declared his will and purpose, not to charge sin upon them, for whom Christ interposed himself a surety: His imputing of our sins to Christ, was formally the non-imputing of them to us; Gods accounting of them unto him, was a discounting of them unto us; for they could not be accounted, or charged upon both, without a manifest contradiction in the thing it self, and in the justice of God; as it is, that a debt should be wholly accounted to, and discharged by the surety, and yet the same debt afterward be justly accounted to, and charged upon him that first contracted it. I confess, a debt may be charged both upon the Principal and Surety, before it be discharged, though afterwards to neither: But the case was not so, between Christ and us; God did not take his Elect, and Christ joyntly to make satisfaction; or him, upon our failing; or us, upon his; but transacted the whole debt upon him alone. Now, I say, the Lord laying our iniquities, in such a manner upon Christ, singly, absolutely, and irrevocably, he plainly declared

clared thereby, that it was his will, never to lay them to our charge.

(2) In that publick discharge or acquittance, which he gave unto Christ at his Resurrection; the Lord by raising him from the dead, and (as it were) setting him free out of prison, openly declared, That he had received full satisfaction, for all those sins which Christ as a surety had taken upon him, *viz.* For all the sins of all the Elect. And for this reason (as an eminent Divine observes [t]) the Lord sent an Angel to remove the stone from the mouth of the Sepulcher, not to supply any want of power in Christ, who could himself have rouled it away with one of his fingers; but as a Judge, when the Law is satisfied, sendeth an Officer to set open the prison unto him, who hath made that satisfaction: So the Father, to testifie, that his Justice was fully satisfied, with the price which his Son had paid, sent an Officer of Heaven to open the prison doors, and to set him free. Christs Resurrection was a solemn judicial act, whereby God the Supream Judge justified both him and us [v], (1) Him, from all those sins which he had undertaken, whereunto our Divines do apply these following Scriptures: *Isai.* 50. 8, 9. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *Acts* 13. 35. *Heb.* 9. 21. (2) Us, from our own sins. The Resurrection of Christ, was (as Mr. *Parker* says well) *an actual Justification*, of all them, for whom he became a Surety; for (1) he was not justified from any sins of his own, being in himself just and innocent, but from those sins which were charged upon him in his death, which (saith the Prophet) *were the iniquities of us all*, *Isa.* 53. 6. If a debt be discharged, it cannot without manifest injustice be charged again; the discharge of the Surety, is the discharge of the Principal. God by acquitting Christ from the guilt of our sins, did also fully acquit us from the same. (2) Christ in his Death and Resurrection was a common person; as in his death he was condemned for our sins, so in his Resurrection he was justified from our sins: All the Elect were justified in his Justification; there is the same reason for their Justification in Christ, as there is for the Condemnation of mankinde in *Adam*. *Therefore* (sayes the Apostle, *Rom.* 5. 18.) *as by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation; even so* (or in like manner) *by the Righteousness of one* (Man, Christ), *the Free-gift came upon all men,*

[t] Dr. *Reyn.* on Psal. 110. pag. 524.

[v] See Cap. 3. sect. 4. Mr. *Th. Goodwins* Christ set forth sect. 3. c. 5.

men, (*viz.* All in Christ) *unto Justification of Life.*

§. 11. Besides the General Declaration of Forgiveness, unto all the Elect, this Gracious Sentence, is also declared to particular persons.

1. Externally, *in foro Ecclesiæ*, by the Sacrament of Baptism, the Minister of Christ, standing in his stead *, by Dipping or Pouring water upon a person, doth in his Name, or by his Authority, declare and publish the washing away of his sins by the Blood of Christ: The principal thing which Baptism holds forth, is our Justification; it was ordained *for the remission of sins*, *Luke* 3. 3. and *Acts* 2. 38. not to obtain, or procure this benefit *ex opere operato*, but to declare, and obsignate unto men their interest therein. In *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5. we are said to be *buried with Christ in Baptism*, and to be *implanted thereby into the similitude of his Death and Resurrection*. The meaning is, That our Communion in the benefits of both, is hereby ratified and confirmed to us. Upon this ground, I conceive it was, That in the *old Liturgy*, persons baptised, are said, *to be regenerated, or born again* y, *i.e.* Translated into a new state, *viz.* From the old *Adam*, into the new *Adam*; *From the power of darkness, to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ*, *Col.* 1. 13. Which Baptism doth not effect, but declare and seal; it having no other cause, but the Grace of God, and the Merits of Christ, *Tit.* 3. 5. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. 1 *John* 1. 7. The late *Assembly* in their *Directory* say as much, *viz. That Baptism is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, of our ingrafting into Christ, of our union with him, of our remission of sins, &c.* It is strange to me, That they who say Baptism is a Seal of our Justification, and hold that Infants (who have not Faith) ought to be baptised, should deny, that Justification precedes Faith. Now though this Declarative Sentence be but ministerial, and meerly of order (like the power of loosing, *John* 20. 23. applied to Hypocrites) to the greatest part of them that are baptised, whether they be *Infants*, or *adulti*; yet to all the Elect (to whom the effects of the Covenant and Seals, do onely really belong z) it is real and absolute. It is no other then the Sentence of God himself, declaring his non-imputation of sin unto them, and their deliverance from death by Jesus Christ a.

2. Internally, *in foro Conscientiæ*, at their effectual Vocation,

* 2 Cor. 5. 20.

y *Christus Justificationem dicit esse regenerationem*, Melanct. in Joh. 3.

z *Sacramenta in solis electis efficiunt quod figurant.* Aug. *Communis est Baptismus omnibus baptizatis, sed non virtus Baptismi.* Lombard. l. 4. dist. 1. a. 6.

a See *Diod.* on Acts 2. 38.

Vocation, when the Lord by the Preaching of the Gospel, doth powerfully perswade their hearts to believe in Christ; for the Elect themselves, before Faith, have no knowledge or comfort, either of Gods gracious volitions towards them, or of Christs undertakings and purchases in their behalf: In which respect, they are said to be *without Christ*, and *without God in the world*, Eph. 2. 12. and Gal. 4. 1. They are compared to an Heir under age, who differs nothing from a Servant, though he be the Lord of all: By Faith we come to see that everlasting love, wherewith we were loved; and that plenteous Redemption which Christ hath wrought for us; for which cause, Faith is called *The evidence of things not seen*, Heb. 11. 1. And God is said thereby *to reveal his Righteousness from Heaven to us*, Rom. 1. 17. *And to reveal his Son in us*, Gal. 1. 16. Now in this sence men are said to be justified by the act of Faith, in regard Faith is the *medium* or Instrument, whereby the Sentence of Forgiveness is terminated in their Consciences; which is daily made more plain, and legible, by the operation of the Spirit [b], sealing, and witnessing unto them their peace and reconciliation with God *. Whereas unbelievers look on God as their enemy, and consequently all their life time are held in bondage through the fear of wrath. A true Believer hath peace, liberty, and boldness towards God; he looks upon all the Promises, as his own inheritance; interprets the Providences of God (even those which Reason would construe in another sence) to be Fruits of Love, and not of Wrath.

[b] *Amor Med.* l. 1. c. 27. sect. 9.

* Eph. 1. 13. & 4. 30. Rom. 8. 16. 1 Joh. 5. 1.

§. 12. Now because this Declarative Sentence, by Faith is like the name written in the White Stone, *Revel.* 2. 17. *Which no man knoweth, saving he that hath it*: Many whom the Lord doth justifie, are accounted by the world to be but Hypocrites; others again are justified of men, who are not justified in the sight of God *; the Lord therefore hath another way of justifying his people, to wit, *In foro mundi*, when he shall publickly, and in the hearing of the whole world, pronounce that gracious sentence, *Come ye blessed of my Father, &c. Matth.* 25. 34. Whereunto some have referred those words of the Apostle, *Acts* 3. 19. *Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come, from the presence of the Lord.* But who so pleaseth to consult with *Erasmus*, *Beza*, and

* Luke 16. 15.

Ludovicus de Dieu upon the place, shall finde there is a great mistake in our English Translators, and that no such thing was intended there by the Holy Ghost: I grant, that the sins of the Elect may be said to be then blotted out, not that the remission of their sins shall be put off, or is not compleat, till the last day, and till they have performed all the conditions required of them, but because this gracious sentence shall be then publickly declared[c], and shall bring forth its Eternal Effect of Life and Glory: And in this sence, I conceive, those Scriptures may be understood, which speak of our Justification, as a future thing, as *Rom.* 3. 30. *&* 2. 13. *&c.*

[c] *Died.* in loc.

§. 13. Now though we have ascribed Justification unto several times or periods, yet do we not make many Justifications: Declared Justification (whether it be *in foro Ecclesiæ*, *in foro Conscientiæ*, or *in foro mundi*) is not another, from that in the minde of God, but the same variously revealed; as an Acquittance in the heart of the Creditor, and in a Paper; a pardon in the heart of a Prince, and inrolled; is one and the same; this manifested, and the other secret; and though there are never so many Copies written forth in several hands, they do not make many Acquittances, or many Pardons, being but the Transcripts of one Original: So though God doth at sundry times, and in divers manners declare his well-pleasedness towards his people; yet is their Justification but one and the same, which is perfect and compleat at once, being his fixed, and immutable will, not to deal with them according to their sins, but as Just and Righteous Persons. By that which hath been said, it doth appear in what sence we assert, *The Justification of Gods Elect, before they believe:* Now what little weight there is in those Objections, which are commonly brought against this Assertion, will be more manifest when we have examined Mr. *Woodbridges* Treatise. Whose first quarrel against us, is for that, (as he conceives) we give too little unto Faith, *P.* 2. But as it is no disparagement to the Blood of Christ, that it doth not move, and incline God to love us, or to will not to punish us; so it is no disparagement to Faith, to say, That it doth not concur with the Blood of Christ in obtaining our Justification; but that by apprehending the Gospel, it reveals and evidenceth to us that Justification which we have in Christ, the proof whereof, is the

task

task of the next Chapter; wherein I doubt not, but I shall be able, through the help of God, to put by all those wretched consequences which Mr. *W.* hath endeavored to father upon this Position, *That Faith serves to evidence to us our Justification.*

CHAP. VIII.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *Exceptions against our saying,* [*That Faith, or the act of believing, doth justifie no otherwise, then as it reveals, and evidenceth our Justification*] *are Answered.*

THe first Charge which he brings against this Gloss (as he calls it,) is, *That it is guilty of a contradiction to the Holy Ghost. It is well known* (sayes he) *that the Apostle in his Epistles to the* Romans *and* Galatians, *sets himself on purpose to assert the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, in opposition to Works. The Question between him and the Jews, was not, Whether we are declared, to be justified by Faith or Works; but, whether we are justified by Faith or Works, in the sight of God, or before God: And he concludes, That it is by Faith, and not by Works, &c.* Though all this be granted, yet it proves no contradiction to the Holy Ghost, in our Assertion: We acknowledge that the Question between the Apostle, and the Jews, was not about the declaring of our Justification; nor about the time when we are justified; no, nor about the condition, upon which we are justified; but concerning the matter of our Justification, or the Righteousness, whereby we are justified; or by which we are accounted righteous. Now the result of his dispute is, That we are justified by Faith, and not by Works; but then the Question will be, How Faith is to be taken, whether *sensu proprio*, or *metonymico*; whether we are to understand it of the Act, or of the Object of Faith? We have shewed before [a], that the Apostle in his disputes about Justification in these fore-mentioned Epistles, where

[a] See c. 6. sect. 2.

where he oppoſeth Faith to Works, he takes Faith in a Tropical ſenſe for the Object, and not the Act of Faith; for elſe there had been no ground for him to make any oppoſition at all, between Faith and Works; and in affirming, That we are juſtified by Faith, he had contradicted himſelf in ſaying, That we are not juſtified by Works; ſeeing Faith, or the Act of Believing, is a work of ours, no leſs then love. And therefore, it is evident, that the Apoſtle, when he concludes, That we are juſtified by Faith, and not by Works, underſtands by Faith, the Object thereof, to wit, Righteouſneſs imputed, and not inherent[b]; which, by way of diſtinction and oppoſition to the other, he calls the Righteouſneſs of God, becauſe it is out of us, in Chriſt, God-man. The reaſon why the Apoſtle calls the Object by the name of the Act, Chriſts Righteouſneſs by the name of Faith, (beſides the elegancy of the Trope) is becauſe Faith aſcribes all unto Chriſt, it being an act of ſelf-dereliction, a kinde of holy deſpair, a denying and renouncing of all fitneſs, and worthineſs in our ſelves; a going unto Chriſt, looking towards him, and a reſting of our ſelves upon his Al-ſufficiency[c]: So that in the Apoſtles ſenſe, we deny not, That Faith juſtifieth in the ſight of God; Faith (I ſay) taken objectively, to wit, For Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs; it is for his Merits and Satisfaction alone, that we are accounted Juſt and Righteous, at Gods Tribunal. But if Faith be taken properly for the Act of Believing, we ſay indeed, That it only evidenceth that Juſtification which we have in Chriſt. Nor is this any contradiction to the Holy Ghoſt, who aſcribes our Juſtification in the ſight of God, to Chriſt alone.

[b] Paulus *fidem accipit*, Rom. 4. 5. *non pro opere, ſed pro objecto fidei* —— *Nomine autem operum intellexit Apoſtolus, non ſolum externa bona opera à lege mandata, verùm omnes etiam internas virtutes, & fidem ipſam quatenus opus eſt quoddam intellectus & voluntatis, quod manifeſtum eſt ex iis quæ in ea Epiſtola* (ſcil. ad Rom.) *mediocriter exercitato.* Zanch. de Nat. Dei. l. 4. c. 2. Theſ. 2.

[c] *Nomen fidei & verbum credendi aperiè docent, juſtitiam nobis aliundè advenire, & eam in nobis realiter non eſſe; ſed tantùm ejus cognitionem, ſenſum & effecta; opus enim fidei eſt ea quæ extra nos ſunt apprehendere —— Hinc igitur vel unica loquutio, per Fidem, ſeu Fide nos juſtificari, ſatis eſſe deberet ad convincendum, nos non juſtificari opere, aut virtute aliqua in nobis exiſtente, cognatâ ipſi fidei, ut virtus & opus eſt, ſed ut quæ extra nos poſita eſt. Favere ſcil. Dei & juſtitiæ Chriſti.* Zanchius ubi ſupra.

§. 2. Next he calls it, *A moſt unſound Aſſertion, That Faith doth evidence our Juſtification before Faith.* Is the Apoſtles deſinition of Faith, *Heb.* 11. 1. *Faith is the evidence of things not ſeen*; An unſound Aſſertion? Though ſome do aſcribe more to Faith,

Faith, then an Act of evidencing, yet I never met with any one before, that did totally deny this use thereof. All the knowledge that we have of our Justification, is onely by Faith, seeing it cannot be discerned by Sense or Reason; either we have no evidence of our Justification, and consequently do live without hope; or, if we have, it is Faith that doth evidence it to our souls. Now let our Justification be when it will, if Faith doth evidence it, it will follow, That our Justification was before that Evidencing act of Faith; for *actus pendet ab objecto*, the Object is before the Act. But I will not anticipate Mr. *Woodbridges* Reasons.

§. 3. *If* (saith he) *Faith doth evidence our Justification; it is either improperly, as an effect doth argue the cause, as laughing and crying, may be said to evidence reason in a Childe, &c. Or else properly; and that either immediately and actionally, or remotely and syllogistically.*

(1) *Faith doth not evidence Justification improperly, as the Effect doth argue the Cause.* I shall readily grant him, that Faith doth not justifie evidentially, as a mark, sign, or token, but as a knowledge, and adherence unto Christ, our Justifier; as that Organ, or Instrument, whereby we look not upon our Faith, but upon Christ our Righteousness; and by the same Faith do cleave unto him. They that make Faith a condition of our Justification, use it but as a sign, or as an argument affected to prove, That a person is justified; seeing, that where one is, the other is also; where there is Faith, there is Justification; and for this cause innumerable other signs, and marks, are brought in to evidence this sign; which are more obscure and difficult to be known, then Faith it self, nay, which cannot be known to be effects of Blessedness, *but by Faith*; whereby poor souls, either *walk in darkness*, live in a doubting, and uncertain condition all their days, or else *compass themselves about with sparks of their own kindling, and walk in the light of their own fire*; fetching their comfort, from Faith, and not by Faith, from Christ. Though I might fairly pass by this Branch of his *Dilemma*, it being none of my Tenent, and favored more by his own, then my opinion; yet I shall briefly give my sence of his Reasons, That Faith doth not evidence Justification as a sign.

Isa. 55. 17. John 17. 3. Phil. 3. 10.

Isa. 50. 10, 11.

§. 4. His first Reason is, because then *Justification by Faith, would*

not necessarily be so much as Justification in our Consciences: A Christian may have Faith, and yet not have the evidence, that he himself is justified: Many Christians have that in them, which would prove them justified, whiles yet their Consciences do accuse and condemn them. To which I Answer, 1. That Mr. *W.* may be pleased to consider, how well this agrees with that passage of his, *Pag.* 15. Where he alledgeth the words of the Apostle, 1 *John* 3. 20. to prove, That if our hearts do condemn us, God doth much more condemn us. 2. I should grant him, That if Faith did evidence our Justification, onely as a sign, or some remote effect thereof, like other works of Sanctification, it would be but a dark and unsatisfying evidence. 3. Whereas he sayes, That doubting Christians have something in them, that would prove them justified; either it is something that precedes Faith, or something that follows Faith, or else Faith it self. First, Nothing that precedes Faith, doth prove a man justified; secondly, Nothing that follows Faith, is so apt to prove it, as Faith it self, because it is the first [d] of all Inherent Graces; it is by Faith, that we know our Love, Patience, *&c.* to be Fruits unto God; whereas some make doubting to be a sign of Faith, they may as well make darkness a sign of light, it being in its own nature contrary thereunto; and therefore it must be proved by Faith it self. 4. Though a true Christian may have a doubting, accusing Conscience (as doubtless there is flesh and corruption in their Consciences, as well as in their other faculties; and there is no sin, whereunto we have more, and stronger temptations, then to unbelief;) yet whersoever there is Faith, there is some evidence of this Grace; as in the least spark of fire there is light, though not so much as in a flame: And the least twinkling Star gives us some light, though not enough to dispel the darkness, or to make it day: There are several degrees of Faith, there is πληροφορία and διαίρεσις, a strong Faith, and a weak Faith. Now the least degree of Faith, carries some light, and evidence therewith; and according to the measure of Faith, is the evidence, and perswasion of our Justification.

[d] ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχὴ τῆς γνώσεως ἀναφαίνεται. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 2. Prosper. ad Dub. 8.

§. 5. Secondly, He urgeth, *If Faith did evidence Justification, as an effect of it, then we might as truly be said to be faithed by our Justification, as to be justified by our Faith.* I see no absurdity at all, to say, That Faith is from Justification causally,

causally, and Justification by Faith evidentially: That Grace which justifies us, is the Cause and Fountain of all good things whatsoever, both of Spiritual and Temporal Blessings, and more especially of Faith, 2 *Pet.* 1. 1. *Phil.* 1. 29. Yet doth it not follow, That [*We must invert the order of the Gospel, and instead of saying, Believe, and thou shalt be justified; we must say hence forward, Thou art justified, therefore believe.*] (1) Because it is not the priviledge of all men, to whom we Preach, but onely of the Elect of God: And (2) because we know not, who are justified, no more then who are elected; though Faith be an effect, or sign of Election, yet it doth not follow, that we must say to any, Thou art elected, therefore believe. (3) When the cause is not *notior effectu*, we must ascend from the effect to the cause, as in the present case.

§. 6. Thirdly, He loads it with this seeming absurdity, *That then it will unavoidably follow, That we are justified by works, as well as by Faith; for works are an effect of Justification, as well as Faith.* (1) It follows unavoidably from his own opinion: For if Faith be taken in a proper sence, for the Act of Believing, it follows, That we are justified by a work of our own; or, if Faith be the condition of Justification, it will follow likewise, That we are no more justified by Faith, then by other works, as Repentance, Charity, *&c.* Which Mr. *W.* and others of his strain *, do make the conditions of their supposed Justification; so that he is like to father the Childe, which he hath sought to lay at our doors. (2) It is not denied, That Works do declare, and evidence our Justification; where the Apostle denies our Justification to be by Works, he speaks of our real and formal Justification in the sight of God, which he affirms, is by Faith, *scil.* Objectively taken, and not of the declaring or evidencing of our Justification; which Saint *James* in his Epistle attributes to Works, in reference to men; and other Scriptures to Faith, in reference to the Conscience of the person justified, *Romans* 1. 17. *Galatians* 2. 16. (3) Though works be the effect of justification as well as faith, yet it will no follow, that works do evidence our justification as well as faith doth. (1) Because every effect is not apt to evidence its cause; especially when the same effect may proceed from severall causes; as smoak is not so certaine an evidence of fire as light.

* Dr. *Hammond* Mr. *Baxter*.

light and heat is; because steems and mists are so like to smoak; so works do not evidence our justification so clearly and certainly as Faith doth, because works may proceed from principles of natural ingenuity and morality, &c. as those Heathens have performed. (a) Because every effect doth not evidence to every faculty alike, but this to one, and that to another; as for instance, forme, or Physiognomy doth evidence a man to sence, but yet reason requires another manner of evidence; so conscience requires a better evidence of our justification then works can give: *Works* do evidence it in the judgement of charity, and before men; but they do not evidence it in the judgement of infallibility, or with that clearnesse and demonstrative certainty which the conscience requires; conscience will need a better evidence then works can give. *Paul* could plead his works before men, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. which yet he never mentions in the pleas of his conscience towards God, and that which conscience dares not plead before God, can bee no good evidence unto conselence.

§. 7. The other horn of his *Dilemma* will be frayd as easily as the former. *Faith* (saith he) *doth not evidence justification properly; for then it must doe it either immediately, and Axiomatically, as it is an assent to this Proposition,* [I am justified] *or else remotely and syllogistically, by drawing a particular conclusion of our own justification, out of generall propositions. But Faith doth not evidence our justification Axiomatically, &c. For* (1) *There is no such thing written, the Scripture doth no where say, Thou* Paul, *thou* Peter, *or thou* Thomas *art justified;* Ergo, *Justification cannot be evidenced by Faith immediately.*

Mr W. here mistakes the nature of true justifying Faith, who (it seems) conceives it to be a bare intellectuall assent to the truth of a Proposition; (such as Devils and Reprobates may attaine unto) contrary to all Orthodox Divines, who doe place Faith more in the Will then in the Understanding. Justifying Faith essentially include. 1. An assent of the understanding to the truth of the Scriptures, revealing the sole-sufficiency of Christ for the reconciliation of sinners, and the non-imputation of sin; as also the will and command of God, that all men should beleeve in him alone for life and salvation. 2, a Fiduciall adherence and reliance of the will upon

See *Down.* of Just. l. 6. c. 5. sect. 3. and *Downs* nature of Justification p. 10.

on the same Christ, the understanding being made effectually to assent and subscribe to the fore-mentioned propositions, *sub ratione veri*, the will is also powerfully drawne to accept, imbrace, and adhere unto Christ *sub ratione boni*. Our Divines [f] doe include both these acts in the definition of Faith, making it to be *fiducialis assensus*, or *assensus cum gustu*: (such an assent unto the truths of the Gospell, as that withall, the soule tastes an ineffable sweetnesse in the same; and thereupon resteth, and relieth upon Christ for all the benefits of his death. They make the principall act of Faith to be the reliance of the heart or wil upon Jesus Christ, and therefore they determine, that the object of Justifying Faith is not a Proposition or Axiom, but Christ, & the mercy of God in Christ: on whom, whosoever rests and roules himselfe, upon the call of the Gospel, hath a certain evidence of his Interest in Christ, and in all the treasures of righteousnesse and remission that are in him; according to the degree of his affiance, or his taste of sweetnesse in Christ, is his evidence or assurance of his owne interest and propriety in him; There is no sense that doth apprehend its object with more certainty then that of Tasting; as he that tastes hony, knows both the sweetnesse thereof, and that he himselfe injoyes it; So he that tastes the sweetnesse of the Gospell Promises, and of that precious Grace which is therein revealed, knows his interest and propriety therein. It is observed of *Jonathan*, 1 *Sam.* 14. 27. *When he tasted a little hony, his eyes were inlightned*; and the Psalmist exhorts us *to taste and see how good the Lord is*. The soule that tastes, *i.e.* beleeves the Gospell, and the goodnesse of God therein revealed to sinners, sees and knowes his interest therein; for all manner of sweetnesse, is a consequent and effect of some propriety which we have in that good thing that causeth it, unto which, the neare our interest is, the greater is the sweetnesse which we find in it: The Soul cannot taste any reall sweetnesse in Christ, and the Gospel, but must needs have some evidence of his interest, propriety, and title to him. Now because (as Dr. *Ames* observes) by this act of Faith, wherewith we rest and rely upon Christ, proposed to us in the Gospell, we doe immediately attaine to the assurance of this Truth [*that my sins in particular are pardoned by Jesus Christ.*] therefore some have seemed to speake as if this Proposition, [*I am Justified, my sins are forgiven me*]

[f] Dr. *Jackson* of Faith, c. 9. and *Downes* ut sup. *Scientia assensiva* Gerson,

[t] *Proprium objectum fidei justificantis est Christus, vel misericordia Dei in Christo, non propositio vel axioma*, Amesius Bellar. Enerv. tom. 4. l. 5. c. 8. sect. 22. *Actus credentis non terminatur ad axioma sed ad rem, fatentibus scholasticorum clarissimis, &c.* Amef. medul. Theol. l. 2. c. 5. se. 2. 24.

were the *proper object of Justifying Faith.* I shall not stand to defend this Expression, though the Doctor doth highly approve of it [h]; Nor will I quarrell with Mr. *W.* about his Expression, though I conceive his terme, Axiomatical is somewhat too narrow; for Faith may be said to evidence our Justification immediately, though it doth it not Axiomatically, but Organically, to wit, as it is the organ or Instrument whereby we doe apprehend and adhere unto Christ, by whom we are justified in the sight of God; the latter term is more adequate to the nature of Faith, which is not only the assent of the Mind, but the adhesion of the Will to the object beleeved. But I shall yeeld him his term, and do say, that Faith may be said to evidence our Justification Axiomatically, yet not by assenting to that which is not revealed; but by assenting to, and withall, tasting and relishing, those indefinite and general Propositions, Invitations, and Promises, that are held forth to us in the Gospell, which by a secret and inscrutable worke of the Holy Spirit, are applyed and made particular to the soule of a true beleever [i], for otherwise he could never taste any sweetnesse in them. So that Mr. *Woodbridges* exclamation against *a carnall, presumptuous, and soule-damning Faith*, is altogether impertinent, seeing we doe not say, that a man is justified by his assent to written, and therefore, much lesse to unwritten verities: If Justifying Faith were no more then an Axiomaticall assent (as Mr. *W.* seems to intimate it is) I see no reason, why all they, that have such a Faith, as Devils and Reprobates, who beleeve with an historical assent, should not be justified; this is *really, the carnall, presumptuous, damning Faith of the world.*

[h] *Sicut conterranus optime observavit.* Ames. Bellar. Enervat. ubi sup.

[i] See D. *Ieckson* of Faith sect. 1. c. 9 n. 4. p. 147. The Spirit makes the general Call particular &c. *Shep.* Sound beleever. p. 222.

§. 8. His second reason against Faiths evidencing our Justification Axiomatically, is nothing to the purpose [*The Faith* (saith he) *by which we are justified, is the Faith which the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel are to preach to the whole world, and to presse it upon their consciences.* Act. 20. 21. 13. 38. 39. *But we cannot presse upon every man in the world to beleeve that he is Justified, &c.*] Seeing we do not presse every man to beleeve that he is justified, though (according to our commission given us from Christ) we do presse all men to beleeve [k], 1. *A sensu intellectus* to acknowlege that there is a sufficiency of merit in Christ for the Justification of Sinners; that they themselves are such,

[k] *Rhetorf.* Exer. Apol. ex. 2. c. 2. p. 228.

ſuch, and that it is impoſſible for them to eſcape the curſe by any other means. 2. *Amplexu, vel motu voluntatis*, to accept, embrace, and cleave unto Jeſus Chriſt, being infinitely better for them, then all the world beſides. By this it will appear, what little reaſon Mr. *W.* hath to charge us with preſſing men to *believe a lie*, ſeeing we require no mans aſſent to any thing, which is not true. We do not preſs every man to believe, That he is juſtified, but to believe, that there is a ſufficiency in Chriſt for his Juſtification, and to relie upon him, and him alone, for this Benefit.

§. 9. So that there will be no *need for Mr. Eyre to retract his Sermons as falſhoods, which he hath formerly preached againſt Univerſal Redemption*: For though the command of believing be to be preſſed upon all men (in that manner as hath been ſhewn) yet it will not follow, that Chriſt died for all men. It ſeems Mr. *W.* is offended at thoſe Sermons of mine, ſince he hath had a ſmack of Mr. *B.* notions, That Chriſt died conditionally for all men; yea, for the Reprobates themſelves; which though it be countenanced with the names of *Cameron*, *Teſtardus*, and *Amyraldus*, & of ſome others, who are of great note amongſt our own; yet (may I have leave to ſpeak my minde) I conceive it to be very unſound: For 1. To ſay that Chriſt died for any, upon an impoſſible condition, is to ſay, That he died in vain, at leaſt ſo far, or in reſpect of them, which the Apoſtle looks upon, as a groſs abſurdity, *Gal.* 2. 21. 2. For whom Chriſt died, he without doubt purchaſed Faith, and all neceſſary good things. This the Apoſtle accounts unqueſtionable, *Rom.* 8. 32. *He that ſpared not his own Son, but gave him to death for us all, how ſhall he not with him alſo freely give us all things?* What is Mr. *Woodbridges* Judgement in this point, I cannot tell, nor doth it much matter that I ſhould enquire. I need not inform him what advantage they that are for Univerſal Redemption in the groſſeſt ſence, do make of his Doctrine of a Conditional Juſtification, impetrated by the death of Chriſt: It is the onely ἀγωνίσμα that they have to ſhelter their heads withal; when they are preſſed, That if Chriſt died for all, then all ſhall be ſaved, becauſe it muſt needs be, that Chriſt muſt have the purchaſes of his death. *John* 11. 42. *Iſa.* 53. 11. *No* (ſay they[1]) *it will not follow, becauſe ſome do not perform the condition required on their parts.* [Theſe two Propoſitions, Chriſt redeemed all men, and yet

1 Dr. *Ham.* Vind. of Pract. Cat. p. 3, & 4. *Quare etſi nemo credidiſſet futurum, tamen fuſſe, ut ſumis meritis Chriſtus conſtaret, omnino creditum — Chriſtus exaudiatur ſemper, ſive ſalventur, ſive non, quia orat cum ea ſola fide conditione.* Corvin. in Mol. c. 27. ſect. 1. & 4. Vid. c. 28. ſect. 14.

yet the impenitent, unbelieving, and reprobate World, ſhall never be ſaved by him, may be eaſily reconciled; becauſe the benefits of Chriſts death are given upon condition, not abſolutely; and therefore they that do not perform the condition, ſhall never be ſaved by his death.] It were eaſie to ſhew that this ſalvability, or conditional Salvation, is the very Corner Stone in the Remonſtrants building.

§. 10. This paſſage puts me in minde of two abſurdities which Mr. *J. Woodbridge*, my Antagoniſts Brother, (who a while after came and preached over his Brothers Arguments, with ſome ſmall Additions) charged upon our Doctrine. The firſt was, *That it doth neceſſarily infer Univerſal Redemption.* Will it follow, That becauſe the Elect are juſtified *in foro Dei*, before they believe; therefore all men are redeemed, and juſtified? One may as well reaſon, Some men were elected before they believed, *Ergo* All men were elected. Perhaps he will ſay, we cannot preſs or exhort every man to believe, That he is juſtified, unleſs all men are juſtified: There is no more neceſſity, that we ſhould preſs every man to believe that he is juſtified, then, that he is elected: This is pitifully inconſequent. The ſecond was, *That it ruſeth the Foundation of all actions, tending to the gathering and reforming of Churches; why ſhould any be excluded from Church Ordinances, if they are juſtified?* (1) I muſt tell him, That I cannot think him an hearty friend to the gathering and reforming of Churches, who deſerted a Congregation in *New England*, whereof he was Paſtor, to become a Pariſh Parſon in the *Old*; and not onely ſo, but hath ſtood to maintaine that Pariſhes are true Churches[m]. It is like *Barford* in *Old England*, is (if not a purer Church) yet a better Parſonage then *Andover* in the *New*. We are not much beholding to *New England* for ſuch Reformers. (2) If we may judge of a mans principles by his practiſe, we ſhould then believe, that he himſelf holds Univerſal Juſtification, at leaſt, within the bounds of his own Pariſh; for, as I am informed, he makes no diſtinction at all in this behalf. I am aſhamed to hear men to talk of Reformation, who tread *Antipodes* to it; eſpecially, when they have liberty to follow the dictates of their Conſciences. But (3) I had thought he had known, that *de occultis non judicat eccleſia*; and that Election and Juſtification, are not the

[m] In a Sermon at an irregular Ordination in *Surum*, where Miniſters are ordained, not fixed to any Church; and ſome an hundred miles diſtant from the place of their Miniſtery.

the rule of admitting persons into Church Communion, but their sound Profession, and suitable Conversation. A Reprobate, or unjustified person, may lawfully be admitted into, and an Elect person may as lawfully be excluded out of a Church. I dare not say, That the excommunicated person at *Corinth*, and others under that censure, were not justified: The evidence we have of mens Justification, is but the judgement of rational charity, and not of infallibility. But enough of this, I shall return again to his Brother *B. W.* who I suppose will not own such irrational consequences.

§. 11. The other part of his contradiction, is, [*That Faith cannot evidence Justification Syllogistically; to wit, By the discourse of Conscience after this, or the like manner, He that believeth, is justified, but I believe,* Ergo, *I am justified. Now* (says Mr. *W.* magisterially enough) *I affirm, that it is impossible for a man, by Faith, to evidence syllogistically, that he is justified before Faith.*] Though I honor him highly, I cannot rest satisfied with his *ipse dixit*; but, what Reason doth he bring for his confident affirmation? [1. *Because there cannot be found a medium before Faith it self.*] *Ans.* Not is it needful there should. (1) It is sufficient, that Faith it self is the *medium*; as thus, He that believeth, was justified before Faith; but I do believe, *Ergo.* The *Major* is proved, because his sins were laid on Christ, and thereby non-imputed to him. (2) To imagine any other *medium* before Faith, is frivolous; for that were to require, that Faith should evidence before Faith had a being. (3) Why may not Faith be a *medium* to evidence our Justification before Faith, as well as our Election before Faith? Seeing the same word which affirms, That all Believers were elected before the Foundations of the World, affirms also, That the Elect without exception are discharged, and acquitted of their sins, *Rom.* 8. 33. Shall we reason thus, Our Election cannot be evidenced before Faith. *Ergo*, We were not elected before Faith? Mr. *Woodbridges* Arguing makes as much against evidencing Election before Faith, as against the evidencing of our Justification before Faith: [*Because there is no sort of persons, of whom* ELECTION *can be affirmed universally, but onely such as do believe; seeing all the world is distributed into Believers, and unbelievers; but* E-

LECTION *cannot be affirmed of unbelievers univerſally.*] It proves indeed, That neither Election, nor Juſtification, are evident to us, before we believe; it doth not prove, That by Faith we cannot evidence ſyllogiſtically, that we were both elected and juſtified, before we did believe. As for that *mad Syllogiſm* (as he calls it) which follows; All unbelievers are juſtified, but I am an unbeliever, *Ergo*. It is the off-ſpring of his own brain, hatcht on purpoſe to make the matter ridiculous: But we muſt excuſe the luxurionſneſs of his wit, ſeeing *Nullum eſt magnum ingenium ſine mixtura inſanie*. His other Syllogiſm, which he hath framed, to evidence Juſtification by Election, as thus, *All the Elect are juſtified. But I am elected; Ergo*: was framed in the ſame mould. A meer man of clouts, which he himſelf created, to ſhew his valor in beating of him. We do not teach men to evidence Juſtification by Election, but both Election and Juſtification by their Faith, proceeding from the Effect to the Cauſe, as we needs muſt, when the Effect is more evident then the Cauſe. Though I like not the Argument, yet by his leave, the Major is ſo far from being utterly falſe, that it is juſtified by the expreſs Teſtimony of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 8.33. But this is beſides the purpoſe. That miſerable circle into which he pretends the poor, reſtleſs, doubting ſoul is conjured by our Doctrine, is but a *vertigo*, and whimſie in his own Pericrany. We do neither bid men evidence their Juſtification by their Election, nor their Election by their Juſtification; but both Election, and Juſtification, by a ſtedfaſt adherence and reliance upon Jeſus Chriſt; and from thence, to reaſon out our particular intereſt in theſe Bleſſed Priviledges, as we do the Being of Cauſes, by the proper Effects which flow from them.

§. 12. His next Argument againſt Faiths evidencing Juſtification ſyllogiſtically, if it be put into the ſcale of an impartial Judgement, will appear as light as the former. It runs thus, [*If we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, becauſe Faith doth evidence Juſtification ſyllogiſtically, then we may be ſaid to be juſtified by Sence and Reaſon, as well as by Faith, which is abſurd.*] This Conſequence indeed is very abſurd; for the concluſion is of Faith, and ſo adjudged by the Schools, if the Major be of Faith; elſe this concluſion (*I ſhall riſe again from the dead,*) were not of Faith, becauſe it is inferred, partly by Sence and Reaſon, as thus, *All*

men

men shall rise again, I am a man; Ergo, *I shall rise again*. Here the Major onely is of Faith, the Minor is of Sence; and yet the Conclusion is an act of Faith, and not of Sence. So in this Syllogism, *He that believes, is justified*; *But I do believe*, Ergo, *I am justified*. Though the Assumption be an act of Sence, or spiritual Experience, yet the Conclusion is an act of Faith, because the Major is of Faith: For though in both these Deductions, Sence and Reason are made use of, yet they are but subservient Instruments, and not the Authors of the Conclusion.

§. 13. Mr. *W.* hath added a third Argument, to prove, That Justification by Faith, is not meerly a Justification in our Consciences, which, I question not, will prove as unsuccessful as the rest. But, by the way, I cannot chuse but take notice, that his spirit of contradiction is somewhat allayed: For hitherto he hath contended, That Justification by Faith, is not in any sence, a Justification in Conscience; now he tells us, it is not *meerly* a Justification in Conscience; and if this will satisfie him, it is like we shall agree; for, before we have shewn, that when Faith is objectively taken, Justification by Faith is Justification by Christ, and in the sight of God, and not onely in the Conscience. And therefore his suggestion in the Minor Proposition, *That we interpret the phrase of Justification by Faith, meerly of Justification in Conscience*, is false and groundless. But let us weigh the force of his Argument a little more distinctly; the sum of it then, is this, *Justification by Faith is not Justification in our Consciences; for then we should be concurrent Causes with God, in the formal act of our Justification: The formal act of pronouncing us just, must be attributed unto us, which the Scripture attributes unto God alone, making us but passive therein, Rom.* 8. 33. *&* 4. 6, 8. To which I answer, That the pronouncing of us just, is not the formal act of Justification, but the imputing of Righteousness, and the non-imputing of sin, which is the act of God alone; whereas the pronouncing of us just and righteous, is in Scripture attributed to others besides God, and yet no robbery is done to God: As for instance, the Minister of Christ pronounceth the Word of Grace, and Forgiveness, and therefore is said to remit and forgive sin, *Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted*, Joh. 20. 23. Is he therefore joyned with God in the formal act of Justification? Yet all Protestants

grant

grant him the office of pronouncing Remiſſion, though they deny him the power of giving Real Remiſſion, which would make him arrogate that, which is peculiar unto God: So, though we ſay, That Faith doth declare and reveal to our Conſciences, the ſentence of Abſolution; yet we do not thereby derogate from God, or attribute that to Faith, which belongs to God. We grant, that, as to our Juſtification in the ſight of God, (which is properly Juſtification) we are meerly Paſſive, we contribute nothing at all, either Phyſically, or Morally, by way of Merit or Motive, That God ſhould account us righteous, and not impute to us our ſins. This work was done without us, and for us, by Chriſt with his Father[n]; it hath no other cauſe, but the Grace of God, and the Merit of Chriſt. *He, and he alone, purged, and waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood, Revel.*1. 5. *Heb* 1. 3. Now in regard of our Paſſiveneſs in this act of our Juſtification, we ſay, That Faith hath no hand at all in procuring, obtaining, and inſtating us in this Grace; for if we did any thing, though never ſo little, in order to this end, we were not Paſſive, but Active: Yet we ſay, That as this gracious ſentence of our Juſtification, is revealed and terminated in our own Conſciences, ſo Faith hath an Inſtrumental efficacy; we are therein *συνεργοὶ agents with God*, 2 Cor. 6. 1. *And the Spirit συμμαρτυρεῖ beareth witneſs with our ſpirits, Rom.* 8. 16. And therefore, though we are no where exhorted to juſtifie, or to make our ſelves righteous in the ſight of God; yet we are oftentimes bid *to grow in Faith, and to preſs forward to more aſſurance in believing our peace, and reconciliation with God*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 5. *&* 3. 18. *Rom.* 5. 1.[o]

[n] See *Heilder.* on 51. Pſal. Lect. 128. p. 604.

[o] *Pacem habeamus.* Vulg. & Syr.

§. 14. This Conceſſion of Mr. *W.* [That a man is wholly Paſſive in his Juſtification,] gave occaſion, to the firſt Argument I offered to his conſideration, it being, as I conceive, a flat contradiction to the cheif ſcope, and intendment of his Sermon, which was to derive to Faith, at leaſt, a Federal or Moral cauſality in our Juſtification. I am ſorry I ſhould have ſo much cauſe to complain of his injurious dealing, not onely in that unworthy language he is pleaſed to give me, but in caſting my Argument into another form, then that, wherein I propoſed it. In his report it runs thus [*If we were altogether Paſſive in being juſtified, then we are juſtified before we believe.*] In which form, I confeſs it is obnoxi-

ous

ous to more exceptions then one; for beſides the Grammatical part, which is very harſh, the Logical conſequence may be juſtly blamed: Though the conſequent be true, yet it is not a true conſequence, it is not rightly inferred from the Antecedent: Though we are Paſſive in our Juſtification, yet it doth not follow from thence, That we were juſtified before we believed. A man is Paſſive in the firſt act of his Converſion, yet it were abſurd to conclude; therefore a man was converted before he had a Being, or ever heard of the Goſpel. But the Argument, as I propoſed it, was as followeth. *If we are wholly paſſive in our Juſtification, then our Faith doth not concur to the obtaining of it, or we are not juſtified by the act of Faith in the ſight of God. But (according to you) we are wholly Paſſive in our Juſtification,* Ergo, *Faith doth not concur unto our Juſtification, or we are not juſtified by the act of Faith.* His Anſwer hereunto I could not very well heed, by reaſon of my diſtance from him, and the rudeneſs of ſome people (who do go for Profeſſors) that ſtood about me; but as I conceived, it was to this effect, That Faith doth neceſſarily concur to the Application of this Priviledge; whereunto I replied, But the Application of this Benefit is not Juſtification; the one being Gods act, the other ours. His Anſwer in Print, we are ſure, is authentick; let us ſee therefore, how well he hath now quitted himſelf from the guilt of this contradiction. 1. He calls the Argument *A childiſh Exception, a peece of witchery, and wonders it ſhould proceed out of my mouth.* I muſt confeſs, I cannot but wonder to hear ſuch language from a civil man, much more from a Miniſter, and more eſpecially from one, who hath ſometimes owed me more reſpect; let the prudent judge, whether there be any ground for this hideous clamor. 2. He ſhapes ſome kinde of anſwer to the Sequel, *That though Faith be a formal, vital act of the ſoul* in genere Phyſico; *yet the uſe of it in Juſtification, is but to qualifie us paſſively, that we may be morally capable of being juſtified by God.* And again, *Faith is required on our part; which though Phyſically it be an act, yet Morally it is but a Paſſive condition, by which we are made capable of being juſtified, according to the Order and Conſtitution of God.* Now here 1. I ſhall deſire the Reader to obſerve how much Mr. *W.* is beholding to a Popiſh Tenent (oppoſed by all our Proteſtant

Writers) to support his cause, which is, *That Faith goes before Justification, to dispose us for it*, &c. *Bellarmine* undertakes to prove that Faith doth not justifie alone; because there are other things, to wit, fear, hope, love, penitency, a desire of the Sacraments, and a purpose of amendment of life: all which (saies the Jesuite) doe prepare and dispose a man for Justification as well as Faith. Against whom all our Protestant Divines which my little Library hath obtained, do unanimously affirme, *That Faith doth not dispose, or prepare us for Justification*; Now were they all bewitched as well as we, who would not subscribe to this Popish Dictate? 2. I shall leave it to the Reader to judge, whether my Argument, or his Answer doth deserve this censure, when he hath weighed the reasons I shall give, *That Faith cannot be said to Justifie by way of disposition, or as a passive condition, morally disposing us for Justification.*

Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. can. 6. & c *Bellar.* de just. 1. c. 12. &c.

Chamier Panst. 3. l. 22. c. 8. *Ames* Bel. enerv. 4. l. 5. c. 4. *Villet* contr. 19. p. 991. *Down.* of Justif. l. 6. c. 7. 10. *Pemble* Vind. fid. c. 4.

CHAP. IX.

That Faith doth not justifie, as a condition required on our part to qualifie us for Justification.

IN regard that the main Point in difference between me and Mr. *W.* lyes at the bottom of this Answer, I shall make it appear we are not said to be *Justified by Faith* in a Scripture sence, *because Faith is required of us as a passive condition, to qualifie us for justification in the sight of God.*

§. 1. That Interpretation of the phrase, which gives no more to Faith in the business of our Justification, then to other works of sanctification, cannot be true; The reason is, because the Scripture doth peculiarly attribute our Justification unto Faith, and in a way of opposition to other works of sanctification, *Rom.* 3. 28. *Gal.* 2. 16. 3. 11. But to interpret Justification by faith meerly thus, That Faith is a condition to qualifie us for Justification, gives no more to Faith then to other works of sanctification, as to repentance, charity, and all other duties of new obedience; which Mr. *W.* and others of the same affirmation, make to be necessary antecedent conditions of Justification. Mr. *B.* includes all works of

of obedience to evangelical precepts, in the definition of Faith [a], in which sence, I presume, no Papist will deny that we are justified by Faith alone, taking it as he doth, for *fides formata*, or faith animated with charity and other good works. And therefore *Bellarm.* [b] disputing against Justification by Faith alone, sayes, that *if wee would be perswaded, that Faith doth justifie, impetrando, promerendo, & suo modo inchoando Justificationem* (which is granted him, if Faith be an antecedent, federal condition, disposing us for it) *then we would never deny that love, fear, hope, &c. did justifie as well as Faith.* Dr. *Hammond* [c] sayes expressely, *That neither* Paul *nor* James *doe exclude or separate faithfull actions, or the acts of faith from Faith, or the condition of Justification, but absolutely require them as the onely things by which we are justified*: Which in another place [d] he goes about to prove by this argument, *That without which we are not justified, and by which, joyned with Faith we are justified, is not by the Apostle excluded or separated from Faith, or the condition of our Justification; but required together with Faith as the only things, by which, as by a condition, a man is justified. But without acts of Faith, or faithfull actions, we are not justified, and by them wee are justified, and not by Faith onely. Therefore faithfull actions, or acts of Faith, are not by the Apostle excluded or separated from Faith, or the condition of our Justification; but required together with Faith, as the onely things, by which, as by a condition, a man is justified.* It is evident that he, and other abetters to this notion, attribute no more to Faith in our Justification then to other works of sanctification. Now this was witnessed against, as *an unsound opinion, a pernicious error, and utterly repugnant to the sacred Scriptures, &c.* [e] by Mr. *Cranford* amongst the *London* Subscribers, *Decemb.* 14. 1647, and by Mr. *W.* himselfe (if I mistake not) amongst the Subscribers in other Counties. It seems (by Mr. *W.*) they were bewitched when they gave their hands unto that Testimony.

[a] 1 Thes. 70.

[b] De Justif. l. 1. c. 17.

[c] Pract. Cat. p. 28, 30.

[d] Vindic. Cat. p. 8.

[e] See Testim. to the truth &c. p 4 & 15.

§. 2. That Interpretation of this phrase, which gives no more to Faith, then to workes of Nature, I meane such as may be found in naturall and unregenerate men, is not true: The Reason is, because a man may have such works, and yet not be justified. But to interpret Justification by Faith, that Faith is a ne-

ceſſary antecedent condition of our Juſtification, gives no more to Faith then to workes of Nature, as to ſight of ſin, legall ſorrow, &c. which have been found in naturall, and unregenerate men, as in *Cain, Saul, Judas* &c. I preſume Mr. *W.* will ſay that theſe are neceſſary antecedent conditions in every one that is juſtified; for if theſe be conditions diſpoſing us to Faith, and Faith a condition diſpoſing us to Juſtification; then are they alſo conditions diſpoſing us to Juſtification, for *cauſa cauſæ, eſt cauſa cauſati*, if theſe legall works are conditions of Faith, they muſt be (according to Mr. *Woodbridges* Tenet) conditions of Juſtification, and conſequently they are *in eodem genere cauſæ* with Faith it ſelfe, *quod erat demonſtrandum*.

§. 3. 3 That by which we are juſtified, is the proper, efficient, meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification; but Faith conſidered as a meer paſſive condition, is not in the ſence of our adverſaries a proper, efficient, meritorious cauſe of Juſtification; therefore wee are not ſaid to bee juſtified by Faith as a paſſive condition, or qualification required to make us capable of Juſtification. The aſſumption is granted by our opponents, at leaſt *verbotenus*, who doe therefore call it a meer *ſine qua non* (which Logicians make to be *cauſa ocioſa & nihil efficiens*[s]) and a paſſive condition to exclude it from all manner of cauſality in producing the effect; though for my own part, I look upon conditions in contracts and covenants, as proper, efficient, meritorious cauſes of the things covenanted, which do produce their effects, though not by their innate worth, yet by vertue of the compact and agreement made between the parties covenanting. But of this we ſhal have occaſion to ſpeak more by and by: It remains only that I ſhould clear the *major*, that That by which we are juſtified is the proper, efficient, meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification; which appears: By the uſe of theſe Propoſitions, *by*, and *through*, in ordinary ſpeech, which note that the thing to which they are attributed is either a meritorious, or inſtrumentall cauſe of the effect that follows; as when we ſay a Souldier was raiſed by his valor, it imports, that his valor was the meritorious cauſe of his preferment; and when we ſay a Tradeſman lives by his Trade, our meaning is, that his Trade is the means or inſtrument by which he gets his living: So here in the caſe before us, when it is ſaid a man is juſtified by Faith, it implyes, that Faith is either the meritorious, or inſtrumentall

[s] *Philip.* apud Keckern. Log. p. 152.

ſtrumentall cauſe of his Juſtification; as if it be taken objectively, for Chriſt and his merits, it is the meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification *in foro dei*; or if it be taken properly for the act of believing, it is the inſtrumental cauſe of our Juſtification *in foro conſcientiæ*. 2. From the contrary phraſe, as when the Apoſtle denies that a man is juſtified *by Works*, and by *the Law*, without doubt his intent was to exclude Works from any cauſal influx into our Juſtification. Now that which he denies to Works, he aſcribes to Faith, and therefore Juſtification by Faith, implies that Faith in his ſenſe, hath a true cauſality, or proper efficiency in our Juſtification. 3 From other parallel phraſes in holy Scripture, where we are ſaid to be redeemed, juſtified, and ſaved, *per Chriſtum, per ſanguinem, per mortem, per vulnera*. All which doe ſignifie, That Chriſt, and his ſufferings, are the true, proper, and meritorious cauſe of theſe benefits; and ſo it muſt bee underſtood, when wee are ſaid to be Juſtified by Faith; and not that Faith is but a *ſine qua non*, or meer cypher in our Juſtification: Faith objectively taken, is a proper meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification.

§. 4. 4 I ſhall make uſe of my adverſaries weapon s of that very *medium* which Mr. *W.* laſt alledged *page* 8. That interpretation of the phraſe which makes us at leaſt concurrent cauſes with God and Chriſt in the formall act of our Juſtification, is not true, becauſe our Juſtification in reſpect of efficiency, is wholly attributed unto them, *Rom.* 8.33. 4.6. 8.3,24. The internal moving cauſe, was his owne grace; and the onely externall procuring cauſe is the death of Chriſt; there is no other efficient cauſe beſides theſe: We can be no more ſaid to juſtifie our ſelves, then that we created our ſelves. But to make Faith a condition morally diſpoſing us to Juſtification, maks us at leaſt concurrent cauſes with God and Chriſt in our Juſtification.

s *Noſtra contra nos dimicat armatura*, Jer. *ad* Johan. Hieroſ.

1. We ſhould not be juſtified freely by his grace, if any condition were required of us in order to our Juſtification for a *condition* (as Mr. *Walker* obſerves well) *whenſoever it is performed, makes the thing covenanted a due debt, which the promiſer is bound to give*, and then as he infers, *Juſtification ſhould not be of grace, but of debt, contrary to the Apoſtle*, in *Rom.* 3. and 4.

2. If Faith were a condition morally diſpoſing us for Juſtification, we ſhould then be concurrent cauſes with the merits of Chriſt

in procuring our Justification; for the merits of Christ are not a physical, but a moral cause, which obtain their effect, by vertue of that Covenant which was made between him, and the Father; now by ascribing unto Faith a morall, causall influx in our Justification, we doe clearly put it in *eodem genere causæ* with the blood of Christ, which I hope Mr. *W.* will better consider of, before he engageth too far in Mr. *Baxters* cause.

§. 5. That interpretation of this phrase which makes Works going before Justification, not onely not sinful, but acceptable to God, and preparatory to the grace of Justification, without controversie is not according to the minde of the holy Ghost; For as much as the Scripture frequently declares, that no mans Works are acceptable to God before his person is accepted, and justified; the Tree must be good, or else the fruit cannot be good, [h] *Luke* 6. 43, 44. *Mat.* 12. 33. *Joh.* 15. 5. [i] That of *Aug.* is sufficiently known, *Opera non præcedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum*; the old orthodox doctrine taught in these Churches here in *England* [k] was, *that works before Justification are not pleasing unto God, neither doe they make men meet* (*i.* do not qualifie, or morally dispose them) *to receive grace*; *and we doubt not, but they have the nature of sin.* I could muster up a legion of orthodox Writers to defend this Tenent, that no qualification, or act of ours before Justification doth prepare or dispose us for Justification. Nay the Councel of *Trent* [l] confesseth, that none of those things which precede Justification, whether it be Faith, or other Works, doe obtain the grace of Justification. But to interpret Justification by Faith, that Faith is a condition which doth qualifie us for Justification, necessarily supposeth a Work, or Works before Justification, which have not the nature of sin, but are acceptable to God, and preparatory to grace, *viz.* the grace of Justification, which is most properly called Grace. [m]

[h] Gen. 4. 4. *Inprimis ad Abel & postea ad munera propter eum; Deus non homines propter munera, sed munera propter homines acceptat. Paris. cap. de meritis. Ideo dicitur* 1 R. 8. 52. *oculi sunt aperti ad preces servi, quia prius nos intuetur justificatos in Christo, quam preces exaudit.* See *Ains.* not: on Lev. 3. 5. [i] *Nihil viriditatis habet ramus boni operis, nisi a radice processit, qui est Christus.* [k] *Art.* 13. *& Rogers* thereupon. [l] *Nihil eorum quæ justificationem præcedunt, sive fides, sive opera, ipsam justificationis gratiam promeretur.* Concil. Trident. Sess. 6. Can. 8. [m] See *Down* of *Just.* l. 3. c. 1. *&* 2.

§. 6. That interpretation of any phrase of Scripture which involves a contradiction, is not to be admitted; but to say Faith is a passive condition that doth morally qualifie us for Justification, implies

plies a contradiction; *Ergo*, The proposition is undeniable, and the Assumption is to me as cleare; To be both active and passive in reference to the same effect, is a flat contradiction. Now that is active which is effective [n] which contributes an efficacy whether more or lesse to the production of the effect. A condition, though in the Logical notion of it, it hath not the least efficiency; and therefore *Aristotle* never reckoned this *sine qua non*, in the number of causes, yet in the use of the Jurists (as we are now speaking of it) it is a morall efficient cause, which is effective of that which is promised upon condition. *Chamier* hath well observed [o] That *omnis conditio antecedens est effectiva*, *he that performes the least condition imaginable for having of any benefit, is active and passive in obtaining of it.* We will look after no other instance then that which Mr. W. hath set before us: An offender against our Lawes that is saved by his Clergy, or by reading his Neck-verse, he is not passive, but active in saving of his life; he may properly be said to have saved himselfe, his reading being not onely a physicall act, but a morall efficient cause, which makes that favourable law to take effect. To say he is passive, because he made not the Law, nor sits as Judge on the Bench to absolve himselfe, is but a shift to blinde the eyes of the simple, seeing that when more causes then one concur to an effect, the effect may be denominated from the lowest, that which doth least is an active efficient cause; nay in this case the Malefactor doth more in saving of his life, then either the Law or Judge: for though *pro forma*, he acknowledgeth the grace of the State, and the courtesie of the Judge unto him: yet as the *Welsh-man* that was bid to cry God blesse the King, and the Judge, cryed, *God blesse her father and mother who taught her to read*, intimated he was more beholding to his reading then to the courtesie of the Judge, for else the Judge would have been severe enough, his mercy would have deserved but little thanks. I must needs tell my Old Friend, *Non loquitur ut Clericus*. We say such a man is Passive in saving his life, who is not required to read or perform any other condition, but receives a pardon of meer Grace: In like manner he is Passive in his Justification, that doth nothing at all towards the procuring of it; he that performs the least condition in order thereunto, is not onely Physically, but Morally active in obtaining this priviledge. For though *he did not*

[n] *Efficiens est unde pendet effectus.*

[o] Tom. 3. l. 15. c. 5. s. 2.

make

make the Law, by, and according to which he is juſtified; nor pronounce the ſentence of Abſolution upon himſelf; yet he hath a ſubordinate, or leſs principal efficiency in producing the effect; nay, a learned man[p] (whom I hope Mr. *W.* will not think *more worthy to be derided, then diſputed with*) tells us, *That he that performs conditions for Juſtification, doth more to his Juſtification, then God, who made onely a conditional grant, notwithſtanding which, he might have periſhed; but he by performing the condition, makes the grant to be abſolute: And truly* (ſayes the ſame Author) *whoſoever makes Faith the condition of the New Covenant, in ſuch a ſenſe as perfect Obedience was the condition of the Old, cannot avoid it; but that man is juſtified chiefly by himſelf, and his own acts; not ſo much by Gods Grace in imputing Chriſts Righteouſneſs, but more by his own Faith, which is his own act, though of Gods work.* God by making his ſuppoſed gracious conditional promiſe, doth not juſtifie any man[q], for that makes no difference at all amongſt perſons: It remains therefore, that man muſt be ſaid to juſtifie himſelf; for where there is a promiſe of a Reward made to all upon condition of performing ſuch a ſervice, he that obtains the reward, gets it by his own ſervice; without which, the promiſe would have brought him never a whit the nearer to the Reward. Thus a man juſtifies himſelf by believing, more a great deal, then God juſtifies him by his promulgation of the conditional promiſe, which would have left him in his old condition, had not he better provided for himſelf by believing, then God by promiſing: as in the old Covenant, it was not Gods threat that brought death upon the world, juſt ſo in the new (if it be a conditional promiſe) it is not the promiſe that juſtifies a believer, but the believer himſelf.

Mr. *Kendal* againſt *Goodwin*, cap. 4. 141.

[q] Ib. p. 140.

§. 7. Mr. *W.* may as well call the Blood of Chriſt a Paſſive condition in our Juſtification, becauſe *it did not make the Law, nor pronounce the ſentence of Abſolution*; let the indifferent Reader conſider, whether this be not (I will not ſay a *childiſh*, but) an impertinent anſwer, which draws his former Conceſſion quite aſide from the matter now under debate; for the queſtion is not, whether man did concur in making the Law and Rule of his Juſtification; but whether he hath any cauſal influx in producing the effect; or whether before Juſtification, he can, or doth per-

perform any condition, to which God hath infallibly promiſed this Grace? Which (if granted) will conclude, That he is not Paſſive, but Active in his Juſtification; when our Proteſtant Divines ſay, That a man is Paſſive in his firſt Converſion: Their meaning is, That he can perform no condition at all, to which God hath inſeparably annexed the Grace of Converſion: So *Cameron*[r] expreſſeth their ſenſe and meaning, *Vocatio nullam poſcit in obje&to conditionem*; For though a man before converſion do perform many natural acts, which have a remote tendency to this effect, as Hearing, Reading, Meditating, *&c.* yet for all we ſay, He is Paſſive therein, becauſe theſe are not ſuch conditions, to which God hath promiſed ſaving Grace: So though a man doth never ſo many natural acts, or duties, whereunto God hath not immediately promiſed this priviledge, he is but Paſſive for all in his Juſtification; but if he do perform any condition, to which Juſtification is promiſed, then he is active, and conſequently may be ſaid to juſtifie himſelf.

[r] *Cam.* Tom. 1. P. 569.

§. 8. But ſays Mr. *W. We do no more juſtifie our ſelves, then we do glorifie our ſelves, it is God alone doth both, and we are Paſſive in both*, Pag. 8. And again, *It is God that glorifies us, and not we our ſelves; yet ſurely God doth not glorifie us before we believe*, Pag. 10.

Firſt, I ſhall readily grant him, that we do neither juſtifie, nor glorifie our ſelves; ſeeing that we obtain neither of theſe benefits by our own works: From the very beginning, to the end of our Salvation, nothing is primarily or cauſally Active, but Free-grace[s]; all that we receive from God is gift, and not debt: Glory it ſelf is not *wages*, but Grace. For though it be called *The recompence of Reward, Heb.* 11. 27. yet that is not to be underſtood in a proper ſenſe, as when the Reward is for the Work, which may be two ways. Firſt, When the work is proportionable to the wages, as when a Laborer receives a ſhilling for a days work, here the work doth deſerve the wages, becauſe the work doth him that payes the wages as much good, as the wages doth the worker. Now ſurely, no reward can come from the Creator to the Creature in this way, becauſe no man can do any work that is profitable unto God, *Pſal.* 16. 2. *Job* 22. 3. *&* 35. 8. *Rom.* 11 35. The very Papiſts will not ſay, that Glory is a reward in this ſenſe.

[s] *Reynolds* on *Hoſ.* 14. Serm. 4. ſect. 18.

Anſwer to G. Joy, fol. 20. b.

Works (ſaith Biſhop *Gardner* [t]) *do not deſerve Salvation, as a Workman deſerveth his wages for his labor.* Secondly, When the work is not anſwerable to the wages, but yet the wages is due by promiſe upon the performance of it; as when a poor man hath twenty ſhillings for an hours labor, though the work be not worth it, yet is it a due debt, and he may challenge it as ſuch, becauſe it was promiſed him: In this ſenſe, neither is Glory a Reward; for under the New Covenant, *Bleſſedneſs is not to him that worketh, but to him that worketh not*, Rom. 4. 5. *We are ſaved by grace, and not by works*, *Tit.* 3. 5. *Eph.* 2. 5, 8. And ſaith the Apoſtle, *If by grace, then it is no more of works*, *Rom.* 11. 6. But when Glory is called a Reward, we are to underſtand it improperly, as when a thing is called a Reward onely by way of Analogy and Reſemblance, becauſe it comes after, and in the place of the work; as the nights reſt may be called the Reward of the days labor, becauſe it ſucceeds it. Thus is that of the Apoſtle to be taken, 2 *Theſ.* 1. 7. And thus the Heir inheriting his Fathers Lands, hath a Recompence or Reward of all the labor and ſervice he hath done for his Father; although he did not his ſervice to that end, neither doth the enjoyment of that inheritance hang upon that condition. In this ſenſe, Eternal Life and Glory may be called the Reward of our Works, becauſe it is a conſequent of them; not that our works have any influence, either Phyſical or Moral to obtain it: All things being given us, in, and for Chriſt alone, *Rom.* 8. 32. *Eph.* 1. 3. And therefore it is called by the Apoſtle *A reward of Inheritance*, *Col.* 3. 24. Which comes to us not by working, but by inheritance, as we are the heirs of God, and joynt heirs with Chriſt. If Glory were a Reward in a proper ſenſe, we might properly be ſaid to ſave and glorifie our ſelves, becauſe we concurred to the Production of this effect; but Mr. *W.* ſayes well, *It is God that glorifies us; Eternal Life is called* his gift *in oppoſition to* wages, *Rom.* 6. 23. 2 *Tim.* 4. 8. *It is ſolely the effect of Gods grace, and Chriſts purchaſe; though God doth glorifie us after working, yet not for any of thoſe works which we have wrought, though by the help and aſſiſtance of his own Spirit.*

§. 9. But yet ſecondly, Though God doth not glorifie us before we believe, yet it will not follow, that he doth not juſtifie us before we believe. For firſt, if we take Juſtification *pro volitione Dei*,

Dei, for the Will of God not to punish, he cannot but know, there is not the same reason of an immanent act of God, which is Eternal, and of a transient act which is in time; or secondly, if we take it *pro re volita*, as it is the fruit and effect of Christs death, it will not follow, that because we have not Glorification before believing, we have not Justification: For though all the Blessings of the Covenant are given us freely, and not upon conditions performed by us, yet God hath his order and method in bestowing of them: He first gives us Grace imputed, then Grace inherent, and afterwards Eternal Glory. And thus some Benefits of the Covenant are by some (though improperly) made conditions of the rest, because they are first enjoyed.

§. 10. That which Mr. *W.* addes, *Pag.*10. and wisheth *may be seriously considered*, hath been considered already, more then once. *If* (saith he) *Justification by Faith, must be understood of Justification in our Consciences, then is not the word Justification taken properly for a Justification before God in all the Scriptures; from the beginning to the end, we read of no Justification in Scripture, but by Faith or Works.* Mr. E. (sayes he) *when the Scripture speaks of Justification by Works, understands it of Justification before men; when it speaks of Justification by Faith, he understands it of Justification in our Consciences: Now neither of these is Justification in the sight of God, and verily neither of them of much worth in the Apostles judgement*, 1 Cor. 4. 3. *The Antinomians may read out their eyes, before they produce us one Text, &c.*] Had he reported my Judgement truly, there had been no room for this Exception. I have said indeed (and by all that Mr. *W.* hath said against it, I see no reason to change my minde) that when the Scripture attributeth our Justification to Works (as in the Epistle of *James*) it is to be understood of our Justification before men; when it ascribes it to Faith, Faith is taken either properly, or metonymically; if it be taken properly for the act of Believing, then it is to be understood of our Justification before God, terminated in our Consciences, or as it is revealed and evidenced to our selves. Justification in Conscience, is Justification before God, as an Acquittance in the heart of the Creditor, and in a Paper is one and the same; this manifested, and the other secret. He that is justified in his Conscience, is

juſtified before God; and Faith apprehends that, which doth not onely juſtifie us in our Conſciences but before God: Or if Faith be taken metonymically for its object, then Juſtification by Faith is Juſtification before God; for it is Juſtification by the Merits of Chriſt, to whom alone, without works, or conditions performed by us, the Holy Ghoſt aſcribes our Juſtification in the ſight of God, *Rom.* 3. 24. *Epheſ.* 1. 7. and in many other ſuch places.

§. 11. *But* (ſays Mr. *W.*) *Juſtification before men, and in our Conſciences, are neither of them of much worth in the Apoſtles Judgement,* 1 *Cor.* 4 3.] 1. I wiſh that Juſtification with men, were of leſs account with Mr. *W.* He beſt knows, whether Conſcience of vindicating the truth, or popular affectation, put him upon this engagement. I am ſure, the former would not have tempted him to thoſe incivilities he hath offered unto me and others, whom (I doubt not) but God will know by other names, then he is pleaſed to caſt upon us. If the later, or a deſire of ingratiating himſelf with ſome of my Oppoſers, did ſpur him forward, though he hath Juſtification before men (which yet I aſſure him is not Univerſal, no not amongſt many that do wiſh him well) I dare ſay, he is not juſtified in the Court of Conſcience, *and if our heart, &c.* 1 *Joh.* 3. 20. 2. But doth the Apoſtle account neither of theſe Juſtifications much worth? Let Mr. *W.* judge in what account he had *Juſtification before men,* by what he ſayes, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. 1 *Cor.* 9. 15. *And Juſtification in Conſcience,* by thoſe bleſſed Effects he aſcribes unto it, *Rom.* 5. 1, 2 3. ſee 1 *John* 3. 21. 3. It is true, 1 *Cor.* 4 3. he ſayes, *That he cares not to be judged of mans judgement, or of mans day*[v]. The meaning is, That he did not regard the ſiniſter Judgements and Cenſures of carnal Chriſtians, who praiſe and diſpraiſe upon light and trivial inducements, like them *Chap.* 1. *v.* 12. *Yea,* (ſayes he) *I judge not my ſelf,* q. d. *I am not ſolicitous, nor do I enter into conſideration what degree of honor or eſteem I am worthy of, amongſt, or above my fellows.* Now, what is this to the purpoſe? What is this to the Juſtification of his perſon in the Court of Conſcience by Faith, or the Juſtification of his Faith and Sincerity towards men by Works? I muſt needs ſay (with a very worthy Divine [x]) *That no ſmall portion of favor conſiſts in a Sence and Knowledge of the kindneſs of God in its actings, terminated upon the Conſcience*; however Mr. *W.* is pleaſed to value it.

[v] Vid. Vorſt. Parath. & Dio dat. Annot.

[x] Mr. *Owen* againſt *Baxter*, p. 91.

§. 12.

§. 12. In his next Paſſage he gives us a Youthful Frolick, to ſhew his gallantry, like Mr. *Baxters* challenge [1], *Let the Antinomians ſhew one Scripture which ſpeaks of Juſtification from Eternity. The Antinomians* (ſaith he, the *Anti-Papiſts*, and *Anti-Arminians*, he means) *may read their eyes out, before they produce us one Text for any other Juſtification in Scripture, which is not by Faith, or Works.* (1) Though the Antinomians are ſo blinde, that they cannot finde one Text for this purpoſe, yet he himſelf is ſuch a quick-ſighted *Lynceus*, that he hath diſcovered more then one: For *Pag.* 23. he tells us of a threefold Juſtification, and yet neither of them is by Faith or Works. I hope he hath not read out his eyes to finde them out. (2) In what ſence the Scripture aſſerts Juſtification before Faith or Works, hath been ſhewn before; but (3) (if I may be ſo bold) I would aſk how long the Anti-Goſpellers may read before they produce one plain Text for any of thoſe Dictates, they would thruſt upon us, *That Juſtification doth in no ſence precede the act of Faith; that Chriſt purchaſed onely a conditional, not an abſolute Juſtification for Gods Elect; that our Evangelical Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified is in our ſelves; that the tenor of the New Covenant is,* If thou believe, &c. *That God hath made a Covenant with Chriſt, that none ſhould have any benefit by his death, till they do believe.* Cum multis aliis quæ nunc, &c.

[1] Aphor. p. 93.

§. 13. Mr. *W.* thinks he hath ſufficiently cleared the coaſt of this Exception [*That Faith in a proper ſence is ſaid to juſtifie, in reſpect of its evidencing property, or becauſe it declares and applies to our Conſciences, that perfect Juſtification which we have in Chriſt.*] But by his leave, it is like to be a bone for him to pick, till the *Index Expurgatorius* hath raſed out thoſe Scriptures which aſcribe our Juſtification unto Chriſt alone. For my own part, I ſee no ſuch cauſe he hath to triumph, unleſs it be in the dejection of thoſe feeble conſequences, which he himſelf hath deviſed to make our Doctrine odious, which we have ſhewn before, are as remote from our principles, as the Eaſt is from the Weſt. I confeſs, neither he, nor I, are competent Judges in our own cauſe; let the Godly Reader judge between us, and hold faſt that which comes neareſt to the Analogy of Faith. I ſhall now addreſs my ſelf to ſcan the force of thoſe Arguments he hath brought to prove;

That the Elect are not justified in the sight of God before they believe.

CHAP. X.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *first Argument against Justification before Faith, taken from the Nature of Justification, is answered.*

His first Argument is drawn from the Nature of Justification. *Which* (saies he) *is the absolution of a sinner from condemnation, by that gracious sentence and signal promise in the Gospel.* [*He that believes, shall not enter into condemnation.*] The Argument he hath cast into this frame, *If there be no act of grace declared and published in the Word, which may be a legal discharge of the sinner, while he is in unbelief, then no unbelieving sinner is justified: But there is no act of grace, declared and published in the Word, which is a legal discharge of the sinner, whilest he remains in unbelief,* Ergo. Whereunto I answer, 1. That his Assumption is false; for the Gospel or New Covenant is a published or declared discharge of all the Elect. The sum of which is, That God hath transacted all their sins upon Jesus Christ, and that Christ by that offering of his hath made a full and perfect atonement for them; whereby the whole spiritual *Israel*, are really made clean from all their sins in the sight of God, as of old, carnal *Israel* were Typically clean, upon the atonement made by the High Priest, *Levit.* 16. 30. Now though they cannot plead it before they believe; yet is it a real discharge, because it frees them from condemnation: As a Pardon granted by a Prince, is a legal discharge, though the Malefactor doth not know of it. 2. The Sequel or Consequence of the *Major* stands upon a sandy bottom, a *postulatum* that will not be granted, to wit, That Justification is the discharge of a sinner, by a published, declared act. We have shewed before, That Justification consists in the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of Righteousness, which is

an act of the Minde, or Will of God. It is a groſs *non ſequitur*, God doth not declare his non-imputing of ſin to his Elect, before they believe, *Ergo* He doth account and eſteem them ſinners. The Queſtion is not, whether this gracious ſentence of Abſolution, be declared; but whether it be not in the Breſt of God, before it be declared? or, whether this immanent act of God doth not ſecure the ſinner from condemnation? If ſo! then there is Juſtification, though there be no publiſhed, declared ſentence. As *Gods ſaying in his heart, That he would never drown the world any more, Gen.* 8. 21. did ſufficiently ſecure the world from the danger of an other deluge, though he had never declared it; ſo Gods will not to puniſh, ſecures a perſon from condemnation, though this ſecurity be not declared.

§. 2. They are but feeble proofs, wherewith he hath backed his Aſſertion, That Juſtification is onely by the promiſe, as a declared diſcharge. *We are not* (ſays he, as if he ſate in *Pythagoras* his Chair) *to conceive of Juſtification, as an internal immanent act of God, reſolving privately in his own Breſt, not to proſecute his right againſt a ſinner; but it muſt be ſome declared, promulged act, &c.* But why are we not to conceive of it, as an internal, immanent act? Inſtead of proofs he gives us Illuſtrations, which may paſs in a Sermon, but are too weak for a diſpute. *As ſin* (ſaith he) *is not imputed, where there is no Law*, Rom. 5. 13. *So neither is Righteouſneſs imputed without Law.* Whereunto I anſwer, 1. Though men will not impute or charge ſin upon themſelves, where there is not a Law to convince them of it, *For by the Law is the knowledge of ſin, Rom.* 3. 20. *&* 7. 9. *Gal.* 3. 19. Yet it follows not, but God did impute ſin to men, before there was any Law promulged; or before the ſin was actually committed: For what is Gods hating of a perſon, but his imputing of ſin, or his will to puniſh him for his ſin? Now the Lord hated all that periſh, ere ever the Law was given. The ſcope of the Scripture alleadged, *Rom.* 5. 13. is not to ſhew when God begins to impute ſin to a perſon, but that ſin, in being, ſuppoſeth a Law; and conſequently, That there was a Law, before the Law of *Moſes*, elſe men could not have ſinned, as it is confeſſed they did: As the Law it ſelf had a being in the Minde of God, ſo the iſſues thereof were determined by him, before it was declared. 2. There is not the ſame

reaſon

reaſon of our being ſinners, and being righteous, ſeeing that ſin is our act, but Righteouſneſs is the gift of God. A man is not a ſinner, before he do commit ſin, either by himſelf, or Repreſentative, which neceſſarily ſuppoſeth a Law; *For ſin is the tranſgreſſion of a Law*, 1 *John* 3.4. But a man may be righteous before he doth works of Righteouſneſs, and conſequently before any Law is given him to obey. Indeed, if we were made righteous by our own perſonal Inherent Righteouſneſs, then our Juſtification would neceſſarily require a Law; for as much as all our Righteouſneſs conſiſts in a conformity to the Law. But ſeeing we are juſtified by the imputation of anothers Righteouſneſs, what need is there that a Law ſhould firſt be given unto us.

§. 3. Mr. *W.* goes on, [*As our condemnation is no ſecret act, or reſolution of God to condemn, but the very voice and ſentence of the Law* [Curſed is he that ſinneth;] (*and therefore he whom God in his Eternal Decree, hath purpoſed to ſave, may yet for the preſent be under the ſentence of condemnation*; *as the* Epheſians, *whom God had choſen to Eternal Life*, Chap. 1. 4. *were yet ſometimes the children of wrath*, Chap. 2. 3.) *So on the contrary, our Juſtification muſt be ſome declared, promulged act, or ſentence of God, which may ſtand good in Law, for the diſcharge of the ſinner againſt condemnation.*] We ſay that condemnation (being taken, not for the Will of God to puniſh, or to inflict upon a perſon, the deſert of his ſin, but for the thing willed, or for the curſe it ſelf) it comes upon men by vertue of that Law, or Covenant which was made with the firſt *Adam*. So our Juſtification (being taken, not for the Internal Act of Gods will, not to puniſh, but for the benefit willed to us by that Internal Act, to wit, Our actual diſcharge from the Law) deſcends to us, by vertue of that Law or Covenant, which was made with the ſecond *Adam*: He performing the terms of agreement between the Father, and himſelf, made the Law of Condemnation, to be of no force againſt us, *Gal.* 3.13. & 4.5. Which New Covenant, and not the Conditional Promiſe (as Mr. *W.* would have it) is called *The Law of Faith*, Rom. 3.27. *And the Law of Righteouſneſs*, Ch. 9.31. It is called *a Law*, becauſe it is the fixed and unalterable Sanction of the Great God; or elſe by way of Antitheſis, or oppoſition to the Covenant of Works: The *Law of Righteouſneſs*, it being the

the onely means whereby men do attain to Righteousness, and are justified in the sight of God; and the *Law of Faith*, because it strips men of their own righteousness *, to cloath them with Christs, and thereby takes from men all occasion of boasting in themselves; whereas, if men did attain to Righteousness by vertue of this Conditional Promise, *He that believes, shall be saved*; they would have as much cause of boasting in themselves, as if they had performed the Law of Works. That saying of his, with which he closeth this Argument, is wide from truth, *That every man is then condemned, or stands condemned* in foro Dei, *when the Law condemns him*; for then all men living are condemned, seeing the Law condemns, or curseth every one that sins; and there is none that lives without sin. Either he must say, Believers do not sin, and then Saint *John* will give him the lie, 1 *Joh.* 1. 8. or else, That Believers are not justified; which is contrary to the Scripture last cited by himself, *Joh.* 5. 24. with a thousand more. In what sence the Elect *Ephesians* were called *Children of wrath*, will more fitly be explained in the next Chapter.

* *Diodat.* on Rom. 3. 27.

Gal. 3. 10.

§. 4. In the mean time we will adde a few Reasons against the main support of this Argument, *That Justification is the discharge of a sinner, by a declared, published act*; to wit, by that Signal, Conditional Promise, *He that believes shall be saved*. Which, when a man hath performed the condition, he may plead for his discharge. Against this Notion, I shall offer to the Readers serious consideration, these following Arguments. First, If Justification be not by works, then it is not by this or any other Conditional Promise, which is a declared discharge onely to him that performs the condition, *i. e. That worketh*: But Justification is not by works *, which we have wrought, but an act of the freest grace and bounty, *Col.* 2. 13. where the word χαρισάμενος [a], which the Apostle useth to expresse *the forgiveness of sin*, ascribes it solely to the Grace of God, without Works or Conditions performed by us.

* Tit. 3. 5. Rom. 4. 5.

[a] *Verbum* χαρισάμενος *ab ipsa gratiæ deductum, ut remissionem gratuitam intelligamus ex parte nostra, nullo pretio à nobis numerato.* Daven. in loc.

§. 5. Secondly, If Justification be by that Signal Promise (*He that believes, shall be saved*,) then none were justified before that gracious sentence was published, which was not till our Saviours Ministery in the flesh; nor was there any sentence of Divine Revelation like it, which the people of God could plead for their

discharge from the Law, from the fall of *Adam*; until the publication of that subservient Covenant in Mount *Sinai* (which is the tenor of the Law of Works) the Lord never made any Conditional Promise, which they could plead for their discharge, and absolution from sin; the promises to *Adam*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, were not conditional, but absolute. Now, if there were no Justification, till God had made some conditional promise, which men upon performing the condition, might plead as their legal discharge, I marvel into what *Limbus* Mr. *W.* will thrust the Fathers of the Old Testament? For they that were not justified, were not saved. But the Scripture gives us more hope, shewing that *they were saved by the same grace, as we are*, Acts 15. 11. God accepting them as righteous in Jesus Christ; who in respect of the vertue and efficacy of his death, is called *The Lamb slain from the foundations of the world*, Revel. 13. 8. For though this rich Grace were not revealed to them so clearly, as unto us, Eph. 3. 5. 1 Pet. 1. 12. Yet the Effects and Benefits thereof descended upon them unto Justification of life, no less then to the Faithful in the New Testament. The Argument in short is this. *If the Fathers of the Old Testament were justified, who yet had not any such declared discharge; then Justification is not by a declared discharge; but the Fathers of the Old Testament were justified, &c.* Ergo.

§. 6. Thirdly, If Justification be onely by a declared discharge, then Elect Infants insensible of this Declaration, and unable to plead their discharge from any such promise, have no Justification. I hope Mr. *W.* is not such a *durus pater infantum*, as to exclude all those from Justification that die in their infancy, which he must necessarily do, if he makes Justification to consist in that which they are utterly uncapable of.

§. 7. Fourthly, The making Justification a declared discharge, detracts from the Majesty and Soveraignty of God: For as much as it ascribes to him but the office of a Notary, or subordinate Minister, (whose work it is to declare and publish the sentence of the Court) rather then of a Judge or Supream Magistrate, whose Will is a Law. And by this means Justification shall be opposed, not to condemnation, but to concealing, or keeping secret.

§. 8. Fifthly, If Justification were by a Conditional Promise,

as a declared discharge, then it would not be Gods act, but our own; God should not be our Justifier, but we must be said to justifie our selves; For a Conditional Promise doth not declare one man justified more then another, but the performance of the condition: So that a man should be more beholding to himself, then to God, for his Justification.

§. 9. Sixthly, We may argue a *pari*: Forgiveness amongst men is not necessarily by a declared discharge, *Ergo*, Gods is not; for there is the same reason for both; and therefore we are bid *to forgive one another, as God for Christs sake hath forgiven us*, *Eph.* 4. *ult.* i. e. *heartily*, or from the heart, as the Apostle elsewhere explains it, *Col.* 3. 17. *Not in word, or in tongue*, but *in deed*, and *in true affection*. Mans forgiveness is principally an act of the Heart and Minde: A man forgives an injury, when he layes aside all thoughts of revenge, and really intends his welfare that did the same; his heart is as much towards him, as if he had not done it: And therefore Gods forgiving of a sinner, is not necessarily a declared absolution. God may justifie or acquit a person, though he doth not declare his reconciliation with him.

§. 10. *Mr. Wandbridge* forefaw the force of this Reason, and therefore hath wisely laid in this Exception against it. *Indeed to our private forgiveness one of another, being merely an act of Charity, there is no more required, then a resolution within our selves to lay aside our thoughts of revenge, &c. But the forgiveness of a Magistrate, being an act of Authority, must be by some formal act of Oblivion, &c. A Vote in the house is no Legal security to a Delinquent; so then, Gods forgiveness being an act of Authority, must neither be an hidden, secret purpose in his own heart, &c. but a formal promulged act. Answ.* 1. I see no reason why God should not have as much power to forgive, without a *promulged act*, as man. It was a saying heretofore, *Papa nunquàm sibi ligat manus*; they that have supream and absolute power, love not to have their hands tyed. I wonder therefore, that Mr. *W.* should be so bold as to limit God, and to prescribe in what way and manner he must forgive sinners; I am sure, the Reason which he gives, is of little force; for Gods forgiveness is no less an act of Charity, then mans; as these Scriptures, *Rom* 5. 8. *Eph.* 2. 4. with many others do sufficiently shew. And though God in

the act of forgiveneſs, may be looked upon as a Judge, yet is he ſuch a Judge, as proceeds by no other Law then his own Will. And therefore (2) we ſay, That though the forgiveneſs of Magiſtrates be by ſome publiſhed act of Oblivion; yet it doth not follow, That God muſt proceed in the ſame manner; becauſe the promulgation of an act of Grace, is for the direction and limitation of Judges, and Miniſters of State; that they do not execute the ſentence of the Law. Now in the Juſtification of a ſinner, God hath no need of ſuch an act, becauſe he is the ſole Judge and Juſtifier himſelf; and therefore the purpoſe of his Will ſecures the perſon ſufficiendy, though his ſecurity be not declared, and makes the Law of condemnation (which depends wholly on the Will of God) to be of no force, in regard of the real execution of it; whether he do plead it, or no; as in Infants, and doubting Chriſtians, whoſe hearts do condemn them; ſome of whom Mr. W. acknowledgeth to be juſtified, *Pag.* 3. & 15. A Judge that hath the Legiſlative power in his own breſt, needs no publiſhed Edict to abſolve an Offender. Now God is ſuch a Judge, as doth not receive, but gives Laws unto all. (3) The publiſhing of acts of Grace, is for the comfort of the Offender, rather then for any need that the Supream Magiſtrate hath thereof, as to the compleating of his act; as for inſtance, the Act of Oblivion was a real Pardon, when it paſſed the houſe; for though Delinquents had no knowledge of their immunity from the penalties which they had incurred, before it was publiſhed in Print, yet the Vote or Sanction of the Houſe did ſecure them from danger, and invalidate the Statutes that were in force againſt them; otherwiſe Delinquents would be more beholding to the Printer that publiſhed that act, then to the Parliament that made it: So the publication of the New Covenant was for the comfort of Gods Elect, and not for their ſecurity, *in foro Dei.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *Second Argument against Justification before Faith, taken from our state by nature, is answered.*

HIs Second Argument seems to be most weighty, which if it be put into a just ballance, will likewise be found guilty of a *minus habens*. The Argument runs thus. [*They that are under condemnation, cannot at the same time be justified; but all the world is under condemnation before Faith.* Ergo, *None of the world are justified before Faith.*] Here I shall (1) enter a Caveat against the *Major*, which notwithstanding his confident Assertion [*that it must needs be true*] doth not appear so unto me, unless it be limited with this *Proviso*, That these seeming contraries do refer *ad idem*, I mean, to the same Court and Judicatory; then I shall grant, That he who is under condemnation is not justified; otherwise we know, it often falls out, that he that is condemned, and hath a Judgement upon Record against him in one Court, may be justified and absolved in another; he that is cast at the Common Law, may be quitted in a Court of Equity. Now the Law and the Gospel are, as it were, two several Courts and Judicatories; they that are condemned in the one, may be justified in the other; they that are sinners in the first *Adam*, may be looked upon as just and righteous in the second: There is nothing more ordinary, then for Christians, at the same time, to consider themselves under this twofold relation, to wit, Their state by Nature, and their state by Grace. In reference to the former it was, that *Paul* cryed out, *O wretched man that I am!* and yet in the same breath, he breaks forth into thankful Expressions for his escape and deliverance[a]. I doubt not but Mr. *W.* hath heard many Ministers in their Confessions, adjudge themselves sinful and wretched Creatures, and yet at the same time plead their Righteousness and Adoption; though their translation from one estate to the other, was

[a] Rom 7. 24, 25.

Rom. 3. 19. not in that very instant: The Law condemns all men living, for that all have sinned. The Law doth not consider men as Elect, or Reprobates, or as Believers or unbelievers, but as righteous or sinners: Believers have no more advantage by the Law, then unbelievers; the Law will not cease to threaten and condemn them, as long as they live: It is true, Believers can plead their discharge, which others may have, though they know it not.

§. 2. But if Mr. *W.* do speak of an absolute condemnation, or of such as are condemned by the first Covenant, and have no benefit at all by the second; we shall then let go the *Major*, and arrest his *Minor* Propoſition [*But all the world are under condemnation before Faith.*] For God doth not condemn his Elect Children, for whom Christ hath died; the Holy Ghost witnesseth *that Gods will*, to wit, of good pleasure, was, *That none of them should perish, or be condemned*; and if the Judge will quit them, who else shall condemn them *? To whomsoever God doth will Life and Salvation, (his Will being absolute and immutable) they are not lyable to condemnation.

* Rom. 8. 33.

§. 3. The Scriptures brought by him to prove his *Minor*, are forced to go beyond the intention of the Holy Ghost, as 1 *Joh.* 3. 18. *He that believeth not, is condemned already.* He that believeth not, is as much, as he that never believeth, or he that believeth not at any time, as Chap. 8. 24. *If ye believe not* (*i. e.* not at all) *ye shall die in your sins.* The scope [b] of our Saviour was to obviate those suspitions and jealousies which are lurking in the hearts of men, as if God in sending his Son, intended not their good, but onely laid a design and ambush ment for their further condemnation. It is no such matter (sayes our Saviour) *God sent not his Son to condemn the world*, Vers. 17. It is an evident sign, that God had no such end in publishing the Gospel, *For he that believes, is not condemned*; he knows that he is passed from death to life; *and he that believes not, i. e.* that finally rejects the Grace which is here offered, *was condemned long before*; *viz.*, by the sentence of the Law, and by the just judgement of God, proceeding against them, according to the tenor of the first Covenant: So that God need not go about to entangle men, who were before fast bound in the shackles of sin and misery; the Law condemned them sufficiently, though their contempt of the Gospel will aggravate their condemnation.

[b] See Mr. *Tho. Goodwins* Sermon on John 6. 37.

condemnation. Our Saviour had no intent at all to shew the state of the Elect, before believing; but the certain, and inevitable misery of them that believe not; by reason of the sentence of the Law which had passed upon them.

§. 4. (2) His next Allegation is as impertinent as this, *Verse* 36. of the same Chapter, *He that believeth not, the wrath of God abideth on him.* It is evident, that our Saviour speaks there of a final unbeliever, and not of an Elect person before believing; the phrase of *the abiding* * *of Gods wrath*, is applicable to none, but unto Reprobates, who do perish for ever: And to say that the place hints, there is a wrath of God which is done away by believing, is but an attempt, to suborn the Spirit, to serve our turn.

* *Notat constantiam & pervitissimam rei adhæsionem.* Camer.

§. 5. (3.) That which seemes to speak most fully to his cause, is *Ephes.* 2. 3. where the Apostle tells the *Ephesians* (whom God had chosen to Eternal life, *Chap.* 1. 4.) *That they were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.* To which I answer, (1) That the Text doth not say, that God did condemn them, or that they were under Condemnation, before Conversion. (2) The Emphasis of this Text (I conceive) lies in this clause [*by nature.*] So then the Apostles meaning is, That by nature, or in reference to their state in the first *Adam*, from whom by natural propagation they descended; *They were children of wrath*, they could expect nothing but wrath and fiery indignation from God: Yet this hindered not, but that by Grace, they might be the Children of his Love; for so all the Elect are, whilest they are *in their blood and pollution, Ezek.* 16. 4, 8. The Lord calls them his Sons and Children before Conversion, *Isai.* 43. 6. & 53. 11. & 8. 18. *Heb.* 2. 9. For it is not any Inherent qualification, but the good pleasure of God, that makes them his Children, *Ephes.* 1. 5. *Rom.* 8. 29. *John* 17. 6. Believers considered in themselves, and as they come from the loyns of *Adam*, are sinful and cursed Creatures, as vile and wretched as the Devil himself, though in Christ they behold themselves made righteous and blessed. It is granted, That Elect Infants have the Righteousness of Christ imputed to them, though they know it not; and I see no reason that can be given, why it should not be imputed to the rest of the Elect before Conversion.

§. 6. Al-

§. 6. Although the Elect are freed from wrath and condemnation; yet in some sence, they may be said to be under it, in regard that the *Law doth terrifie and affright their consciences, Rom.* 4. 15. In which respect, it is called *A ministration of wrath, and of death, 2 Cor.* 3. 7, 9. The wrath of God hath a threefold acception in the Scripture[c]. 1. It signifies the most just, and immutable Will of God to deal with a person or persons according to the tenor of the Law, and to inflict upon them the punishment which their sins shall deserve: And in this sence, none but Reprobates are under wrath; who for this cause are said to be *hated of God.* (2) It notes the threatnings and comminations of the Law, *Rom.* 1. 18. *Psal.* 6. 1. *Hos.* 11. 9. *Jonas* 3. 9. *&c.* (3). It notes the execution of those threatnings, or the punishments threatned, *Ephes.* 5. 6. *Luke* 21. 23. *Matth.* 3. 7. Now in the first and third sence, the Elect never were, nor shall be, under wrath; God never intended to deal with them according to the tenor of the Law; nor doth he inflict upon them the least evil, upon that account, Christ having freed and delivered them from the Curse: But as wrath is taken in the second sense, for the comminations and threatnings of the Law, so they are under wrath, till they are able to plead their discharge and release by the Gospel. The threatnings of the Law, do seize upon and arrest their Consciences, no less then others; and therefore the Law is compared to a rigid School-Master *, which never ceaseth to whip and lash them, until they flye unto Christ. For though he hath freed them from the Curse, yet the Lord sees it fit they should for a while be held under the Pedagogy and Ministration of the Law, that they may learn to prize the Redemption which they have by Christ, *Gal.* 3. 22. The Lord, when he published the Law in *Sinai* (as the Apostle observes, *Gal.* 3. 17.) *Did not repent him of his promise*, made Typically with *Abraham* and his Seed, but really with Christ, and the Elect in him: *But* (sayes he) *the Law was added, because of transgression, i. e.* To discover their sinfulness and misery by nature, and to render the Grace of the promise more desirable, *Vers.* 22. As the Saints in the Old Testament were Heirs of the Promise, had a real and actual Interest in all the Blessings of the New Covenant, whilest their Consciences were whipped and scourged by this merciless School-master; so all the rest of the Elect are partakers of the

[c] *Zanch. de Nat. Dei. l. 4. c. 6. q. 1. Thes.*

* Gal. 3. 24.

Gal. 4. 1, 2.

the same Grace of Life, though the Law doth terrifie and condemn them: The threatnings of the Law do not shew what is the state of a person towards God, or how God doth account of him; but what he is by nature, and what he hath deserved, should be inflicted upon him; which a man cannot chuse but expect, and fear, till his Conscience be secured by better promises: So that I shall not be afraid to say, That the Consciences of the Elect before Faith, are under wrath, and not their Persons; and though their Consciences do condemn them, yet God doth not. But against this Mr. *W.* hath sundry Exceptions.

§. 7. *The condemnation they are under, is the condemnation of the Law; which pronounceth all men guilty, not onely in their own conscience, but before God. Rom.* 3. 19. *Answ.* That the voice or sentence of the Law, shews not who are condemned of God, but who are guilty and damnable in themselves, if God should deal with them by the *Law*, which is the scope of the Apostle, *Rom.* 3. 19, 20. *That all the world might become guilty before God.* So indeed are all men considered according to what is due by the Law, *Psal.* 143. 2. But the Elect as considered in the Grace, and forgiveness of God, and the perfect satisfaction of Jesus Christ, are discharged from this rigorous Court, their cause is judged at another Bar. *Except.* 6. *Answ.*

§. 8. *The condemnation of an unbelievers conscience, is either true or false; if true, then it is according to the judgement of God, and speaks as the thing is, and so God condemns as well as the conscience, &c. Answ.* The testimony of an unbelievers conscience is true, so far as it agrees with the written word; if it witnesseth to a man any thing, which is neither in the word, nor necessarily deduced from it; the testimony is false and sinful. For understanding whereof, we must know, that there is a threefold act of conscience about sin; the first, When it witnesseth to us concerning the desert of sin; the second, When it witnesseth to us concerning the act of sin, or the sins which we have done: the third is, When it witnesseth to us concerning our final state and condition before God. Now if Conscience doth bear witness to a man, concerning what he hath done, and what is his desert in so doing, it doth but its duty, *Rom.* 1. 34. But if it tell a man, that for the sins which he hath done, he is a damned Creature, and must *Except.* 7. *Answ.*

perish everlastingly; such a Conscience is both penally and sinfully evil. The Conscience of an unbeliever accuseth truly, when it convinceth him of sin; that Death eternal is the wages of it; and that by the Law he can expect no other: But if it proceeds to tell a man, that his case is desperate, and without hope, it pronounceth a false sentence. For though he be a Reprobate, and consequently the sentence is true in it self, yet it is a false testimony in him, for as much as conscience witnesseth that, which it cannot certainly know; how much more is it a false testimony, when the Conscience of an Elect person doth make such a conclusion against himself, That God hath absolutely condemned him to Hell torments, it is false in it self, and false in him: If it were a true sentence, it were then impossible he should be saved; *For condemnation* (as Mr. *W.* confesseth a little after) *is opposed to Salvation*; and the Law saith not *Non cursed*, but *cursed for ever*, *Mat.* 25. 41. And therefore, I say, If the Conscience of any sinner, either Elect or Reprobate, shall in this life, pass such an absolute and peremptory sentence against himself, that the curse of the Law shall be inflicted upon him, he sins both against the Law, and the Gospel. (1) Against the Law, by applying the Ministery thereof to a wrong end; and not as God hath intended it, for the Law was not given *ex primaria intentione*, to condemn men [a], but to further and advance the Ministery of the Gospel; that men seeing what they are by nature, and what they have deserved, might flee for refuge unto Jesus Christ. Now when men, hearing the Curse of the Law, conclude, that surely this must be their portion, and that it is never the nearer for them, that the Son of God hath shed his Blood for sinners, they sin against the Law; in regard the end of the Law is to cause them to flee unto Christ; so that by making the sentence of the Law absolute, they quite cross the design and intention of God in giving the Law. (2) They deny the very tenor and substance of the Gospel, which is, *That in Christ there is life eternal for sinners*; and for ought that they can know to the contrary for them, as well as for others.

[a] See Dr. *Reynolds* three Treatises, p. 385.

1 Tim. 1. 15. 1 Joh. 5 10, 11.

§. 9. Though we say, That the sentence of condemnation, which men pass upon themselves in this life, is false and erroneous, yet are we innocent of those ugly consequences which Mr. *W.* would thrust upon us, *Of blinding mens eyes, and hardening their hearts, and searing*

searing up their consciences, &c. Which are more likely to follow upon an indiscreet application of the Law, and urging only the voice thereof the definitive sentence of God, upon all Transgressors; which is the ready way to make men quite desperate, and to harden their hearts in unbelief. We hold it necessary, That the Law should be preached to unbelievers in its strictness, rigor, and inexorable severity; that they may see there is no hope for them at all, by the works of the Law; yet we would have it preached as an Appendant to the Gospel, not to drive men to despair, but to believe, and to flee to that Sanctuary which is opened in the Gospel; whereas if it be published alone, and as an absolute sentence, it is a bar to Faith: For if God doth condemn men, who shall justifie them? Christs merits will not save them, whom God doth condemn; witness Reprobate Men and Angels, *unto whom there remaineth no sacrifice at all for sin.*

§. 10. His third Exception is, *That the condemnation with which the unbeliever is condemned, is expressed* John 3. 36. *by the abiding of Gods wrath upon him.* Therefore we say, no Elect unbeliever is condemned of God, because the wrath of God doth not abide upon him. The condemnation wherewith the unbeliever, *i. e.* The final unbeliever is condemned, is indeed the abiding of Gods wrath, that is, he shall die everlastingly, for it is opposed to everlasting life; but what is this to the Elect, who are not final unbelievers? Except. 3. Answ.

§. 11. His fourth and last is, *That the condemnation of unbelievers is opposed to Salvation,* John 3. 17. *And surely the condemnation that is opposed to Salvation, is more then the condemnation of a mans own conscience, &c.* I answer, 1. That the condemnation opposed to Salvation, is damnation; and then by Mr. *Woodbridges* Argument, the Elect, because they are sometimes unbelievers, must all be damned. But 2. this rather shews (as I said before,) that, by him that believeth not, is meant, he that believeth not at all. Except. 4. Answ.

CHAP. XII.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges third, fourth, and fifth Arguments are answered.

His third Argument is drawn from the several comparisons by which Justification by Faith is illustrated. *Sometimes it is compared to the Israelites looking up to the Brazen Serpent for healing*, Joh. 3. 14. Numb. 21 8. *As then, they were not first healed, and then looked up to see what healed them, but they did first look upon the Serpent, and then they were healed. Even so it is the Will of God, that whosoever seeth, and believeth the Son, shall be justified*, John 6. 40. *Sometimes Faith is compared to eating, and Justification to the nourishment which we receive by our meat, &c.* To which I answer, 1. That comparisons prove nothing, unless they are framed by the Holy Ghost for the thing in question. Now I utterly deny that it was the intent of the Holy Ghost, in either of these comparisons, to shew in what order, or method we are justified in the sight of God. 2. The stinging of the fiery Serpents did plainly shadow forth the effects of the Law in Conscience. The Law by *revealing the wrath of God, against all unrighteousness* [a], *stings and wounds mens consciences* [b]; for which cause it is called, *a fiery Law*, Deut. 33. 2. To wit, from its effects, because it doth, as it were, *kindle a fire in mens bones; they have no rest in their souls, until these wounds are healed* [c]. Now as the *Israelites* when they were stung by those fiery Serpents, found no ease, till they looked up unto the Brazen Serpent: So the soul that is smitten and wounded by the Ministery of the Law, will never finde rest, till it looks unto him, in whose wounds and stripes is the healing of sinners [d]. 3. This very comparison doth make against him; as the *Israelites* were alive, when they looked upon the Brazen Serpent, or else they could not have seen it: So they that look upon Jesus Christ, *i. e.* Believe in him, are spiritually alive, or else they could not put forth such a vital

[a] Rom. 1. 17. & 4. 15.
[b] Prov. 18. 14.
[c] Psal 102. 3. & 38. 3.
[d] Isai 53. 5. John 3. 14.

vital act. It is said indeed, *Numb.* 21. 9. that when any man that was bitten, beheld the Serpent of Brass, *he lived*, *i. e.* He was healed, or had ease from his anguish; so they that by Faith look up unto the Antitype, they finde ease and rest for their wearied souls; they do then live, *i. e.* they have the comfort and enjoyment of that life, which before they had in Christ. A man is said to live, when he lives comfortably and happily [e].

[e] *Vita non est vivere sed valere. Non est bestius, qui se esse non putat.* See Eccles. 6. 2.

§. 2. 4. Mr. *W.* to make the comparison suit, hath falsified the Text, *Joh.* 6 40. The words are, *It is the Will of God that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life*; it is not (*may be justified*) as he corrupts it. (5) Whereas he sayes, *Faith is compared to eating, and Justification to nourishment, Joh.* 6. 51. It is a mistake like the former, for it is Christ himself, who throughout that Chapter is compared to bread and food; whom by Faith we receive for our refreshment, consolation, and spiritual nourishment.

§. 4. His fourth Argument is drawn from the perpetual opposition between Faith and Works; from whence he reasons thus. *What place and order works had to Justification in the Covenant of Works, the same place and order Faith hath to our Justification in the Covenant of Grace: But Works were to go before our Justification in the Covenant of Works.* Ergo, *Faith is to go before our Justification in the Covenant of Grace.* I answer, That his *Major* is extreamly gross; I dare say, a more unsound Assertion cannot be picked out of the Writings, either of the *Papists* or *Arminians*, then this is. *That Faith* (taking it as he doth in a proper sence) *hath the same place in the Covenant of Grace, as works have in the Covenant of Works.* That I have not charged him too high, will appear to any one that shall consider these few particulars.

First, Works in the first Covenant, are meritorious of Eternal life; he that doth the works required in the Law, may in strictness of Justice, claim the promise as *a due debt*, *Rom.* 4. 4. Was ever any Protestant heard to say, That Faith and Faithful actions (which, as hath been shewn men of his notion do include in Faith,) do merit Eternal life?

Secondly, Works in the first Covenant, are the matter of our Justification; he that doth them, is thereby constituted just and

righteous in the ſight of God. Righteouſneſs conſiſts in a conformity to the Law, ſo that whoſoever keeps the Law, muſt needs be righteous: But now Faith is not the matter of our Righteouſneſs, God doth not account men righteous, for their Faith; I confeſs, he hath *Bellarmine* and *Arminius* on his ſide, who ſay, that *ipſa fides*, or the 1b *credere imputatur in juſtitiam*[t], but the Apoſtle hath taught us other Doctrine, *Rom.* 5. 19. That *by the obedience of one* (*i. e.* of Chriſt) *many are made righteous.* And 2 Cor. 5. 21. *That we are made the Righteouſneſs of God in him.*

[t] Vid. ſup. c. 6. ſect. 4.

Thirdly, If Faith hath the ſame place in the ſecond Covenant, as Works in the firſt, then muſt God account Faith to be perfect Righteouſneſs, which is contrary to his Truth and Juſtice: To ſay that Faith is perfect Righteouſneſs by the ſecond Covenant, though not by the firſt, is but *petitio principii*; Legal and Evangelical Righteouſneſs, being one and the ſame, as to the matter of Righteouſneſs, though they are inherent in divers ſubjects. The firſt Covenant requires a Righteouſneſs in us, the ſecond gives and accepts a Righteouſneſs which is anothers.

Rom. 2. 2.

Fourthly, If Faith hath the ſame place in the ſecond Covenant, as Works had in the firſt, then were the ſecond Covenant, a Covenant of Works, ſeeing Faith is a work, and a work of ours: So that by this means the two Covenants ſhould be confounded, nor would the latter be any whit more of Grace, then the former.

Fifthly, This Aſſertion makes Faith to be not of Grace, becauſe not from the Covenant of Grace, ſeeing the Covenant it ſelf depends upon it. How contrary this Doctrine is to the ſenſe of our Proteſtant Divines, hath in part been ſhewed before [u], who till this laſt Age have taught, that theſe two Propoſitions [*A man is juſtified by Works*] and [*A man is juſtified by Faith*] do carry meanings utterly oppoſite to one another [h]. The one is proper and formal, the other is metonymical and relative. In this Propoſition [*A man is juſtified by Works*] we are to take all in a plain and literal ſence, That God doth account him that hath kept the Law, exactly in all points, a righteous perſon, and conſequently worthy of Eternal life; but now that other Propoſition [*A man is juſtified by Faith*] we muſt underſtand it Relatively thus; That a ſinner is juſtified in the ſight of God, from all ſin and puniſhment by Faith,

[u] Cap. 6. ſect. 2.

[h] Vid. *Calv.* Inſtit. l. 3. c. 2. ſect. 2. *Pemb.* Vind. fid. p. 24. in quarto.

Faith, *i.e.* By the Obedience and Righteousness of Jesus Christ, which we receive and apply unto our selves by true Faith.

§. 4. Let us now hear what *Mr. W.* hath to say for the defence of his *Major*, which resists *Antipodes* to the current of all our Protestant Writers. *If* (saith he) *the Minor be granted, the Major must be out of Question.* I must confess, if confidence did prove, here were proof enough. That which he adds, hath as little weight, as (1) *Why should not*, Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, *(which is the tenor of the New Covenant*, Rom. 10. 6, 9.) *plead as strongly for the antecedency of Faith to Justification in this Covenant, as*, do this and live, *doth evince, that works were necessary antecedents of Justification in the Old Covenant? Answ.* Here he takes for that granted, which will certainly be denied; *scil.* That, *believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, is the tenor of the New Covenant; for (1) it is no where called so, (2) where the New Covenant is recited, as *Jer.* 31. *Heb.* 8. it runs quite in another strain, it doth not promise Salvation upon condition of Faith, but Faith and Salvation, and all other Blessings, present and future. That Text *Rom.* 10. 6, 9. is not the tenor of the New Covenant, for that requires *Confession* as well as *Faith*, and then the Justification of the New Covenant should be called Justification by Confession, as well as by Faith. The Apostle there describes the persons that shall be saved, they are such as do believe and profess the truth: His scope (as our Divines have noted) is to resolve that grand and important Question, How a man may know that he shall be saved? *You need not* (saies he) *to ascend into Heaven*, or *descend into Hell, &c.* to fetch Christ himself to tell you by immediate Revelation, whether you shall be justified and saved; we have neerer and more certain evidences: *He that believes with the heart, &c.* In this Scripture he gives us two marks or characters of a true Christian; one Internal, known only to the Christian himself, *Believing with the heart*; the other External, or visible to men, *Confession with the mouth*: But of this we shall have occasion to speak more anon.

[1] See Shepherds Sound Believer, p. 230.

§. 5. (2) He urgeth, *That Faith and Works have the like order to Justification, in their respective Covenants, or else Justification by Faith, and Justification by Works, were not opposed,*

oppoſed, as they conſtantly are in the Apoſtles Writings, &c. We grant, that there is a true and formal oppoſition between Faith and Works: The Affirmative, which the Jews pleaded for [*That a man is juſtified by Works*;] and the Negative, which the Apoſtle contended for, [*That a man is not juſtified by Works*] but by Faith, are as oppoſite as Eaſt and Weſt, and as impoſſible to be reconciled, as light and darkneſs: But then Faith muſt be taken Objectively, and not Properly; for that which is formally oppoſed to Works, is not the act, but the object of Faith, to wit, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which we apprehend and enjoy by Faith, for if by Faith, he had meant the *ni credere*, or act of believing, there were no oppoſition at all between Faith and Works, and the eſtabliſhing of Juſtification by Faith, will in no wiſe deſtroy Juſtification by Works; and conſequently (to uſe *Mr. Woodbridges* Expreſſions) there would be nothing but *falſhoods and equivocations in all the Apoſtles Diſputations, againſt Juſtification by Works*. How eaſily might the Jews, and the Apoſtle, I will adde the Papiſts and Proteſtants, be reconciled? They ſay we muſt be juſtified by Works, and theſe ſay we muſt be juſtified by Faith, which is a work of ours, and ſuch as includes all other works of new Obedience; an eaſie diſtinction will ſalve the matter. We are not juſtified by Works, as they are conditions of the firſt Covenant, but we are juſtified by Works, as they are conditions of the ſecond Covenant. We are not juſtified by Works, as they are our Legal Righteouſneſs, but we are juſtified by Works, as they are our Evangelical Righteouſneſs. Was it beſeeming the gravity of ſo great an Apoſtle, to raiſe ſo ſharp a conteſt about a triſle, as the denomination of Works from the firſt and ſecond Covenant, when as the Works are the very ſame, in reſpect both of the matter and ſubject? Would not all men have cenſured his Writings to be but ſtriſes of words?

§. 6. His fift Objection is raiſed from 1 *Cor.*6.11. *Such were ſome of you, but you are waſhed, but you are juſtified in the Name of the Lord Jeſus. Where* (ſayes he) *there is an evident oppoſition between the time paſt, and preſent, in reſpect of their Juſtification.* And thence he argues, *Now you are juſtified*, Ergo, *not before, or before you were unjuſtified.* To which I anſwer, (1) That the words do not countenance this inference: He ſayes indeed,

indeed, that in times past they were *unsanctified*, they had been *Fornicators Idolaters, &c. i. e.* As vile and wicked as the worst of men, for which sins they deserved to be shut out of the Kingdom of God, no less then they that are damned: He doth not say, that they were unjustified before Conversion; they were reclaimed or cleansed from those sins, by the Preaching of the Gospel, but they were justified from those sins, in, or *by the name, i. e.* The Merit and Righteousness of *Jesus Christ*, which was imputed to them by God, whilest they lived in unbelief. But (2) if any man will strain this consequence from the words, *You are justified, Ergo*, You were not, whilest you lived in these sins; I shall then own the answer, which he rejects with so much scorn and contempt, *That they were not justified before Conversion, either* in foro Conscientiæ, *or* in foro Ecclesiastico; not doubting, but that I shall sufficiently clear it from his Exceptions.

§. 7. The first of which is, *Why might they not be said to be sanctified before Conversion, as well as justified.* I answer, that there is not the same reason for a mans Sanctification before Faith and Conversion, as there is for his Justification. For (1) to say, That an unconverted person is sanctified, is, *contradictio in adjecto*; but it is no contradiction to say, That an ungodly or unconverted person is justified, which is the expression of the Holy Ghost, *Rom.* 4. 5. Sanctification consists in our Conversion, or turning unto God; but our Justification, in Gods accounting unto us the Righteousness and satisfaction of his Son; the one is a work or act of God done without us, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. but the other is the operation of God within us. God cannot sanctifie us without holiness, because he cannot do contradictions; but God may justifie us, if he please, without Faith and Inherent holiness, because that, *ex natura rei* is no contradiction. Our Sanctification flows from Faith, as the principle and motive of it, 1 *John* 3. 3. & 4. 19. *Gal.* 5. 6. But now our Justification hath not that dependence upon Faith, seeing that is Gods act, and not ours; though we are said to be sanctified by Faith, yet not in that sense, that we are said to be justified by Faith. Faith is Active in the one, but Passive in the other; it is onely the Hand or Instrument that receives our Justification, it is the principle or efficient which operates and produceth our Sanctification. (2) Though Justification

Except. 1. *Answ.*

be sometimes taken for the declared sentence of Absolution in the Court of Conscience; yet it follows not, that Sanctification should be so understood; because the sentence of Justification is terminated in Conscience: But Sanctification is diffused throughout the whole man, 1 *Thes.* 5. 23. Sanctification is not our knowing that we are sanctified, but the conformity of our faculties, and their operations to the rule of holiness: So that his Assertion, that [*Nothing can be alledged for Justification before believing, which will not hold as strongly for Sanctification before believing*] hath nothing but confidence to support it.

Except. 2. §. 8. His next Exception is, *That the Justification they now had, was that which gave them right and title to the Kingdom of God, which right and title they had not before they believed, &c. For if they had this right before they believed, then whether they believed, or no, all was one, as to the certainty of their Salvation; and they might have gone to Heaven, though they had lived and died without Faith.* To which I answer, 1. That these Elect *Corinthians* had no more right to Salvation after their believing, then they had before: For their right to Salvation was grounded onely upon the purpose of God, and the purchase of Jesus Christ. Salvation is a gift freely bestowed upon us, and not a *debt*, or *wages* that becomes due to us upon the performance of conditions. 2. It will not follow from hence, That then they might have gone to Heaven without Faith; seeing Christ hath purchased Faith for his people, no less then glory, 2 *Pet.* 1. 1. And God hath certainly appointed, that all that live to years of discretion, whom in his secret Justification he hath adjudged to life, shall have this evidence of Faith, *Acts* 13. 48. & 2. 47.

Anſw.

Rom. 6. 23.
1 Cor. 2. 12.

Except. 3. §. 9. But (sayes Mr. *W.*) *this evidence is of such necessity, as that if they have it not, they shall loose that life to which they are adjudged, or no: If not, then whether they believe, or do not believe, they shall be saved; if it be, then there is no absolute Justification before Faith, and Justification, must be conditional.* *Anſ.* 1. By this Argument, not onely Faith, but all other works of Sanctification, and perseverance in them, must be the conditions of our Justification; and consequently, we may be said to be justified and saved by them. The Scriptures speak the same things of works, as it doth of Faith, *Mark* 16. 16. *Prov.* 28. 18. 1 *Tim.*

Anſw.

1 *Tim.*4.16. *Matth.*24.13. Now let him consult with our Protestant Divines, whether this be a good Argument, *No man is saved, or glorified without works*, Ergo, *Men are saved by works?* 2. This reason makes as much against absolute Election before Faith, as against absolute Justification: He may argue as well, Faith is of such necessity, that they that have it not, shall loose the life, to which they are elected, or not: If not, then whether the Elect believe, or not, they shall be saved; if it be, then there is no absolute Election before Faith, and Election must be conditional, contrary to many Scriptures, 2 *Tim.*2.19. *Rom.*9.11. *Mark* 13.22. But 3. to the Argument, we say, That Election and Justification are absolute, because they depend upon no antecedent condition in the person elected and justified, not because they are absolute without the consequents that depend upon them, so that notwithstanding all that hitherto he hath brought, the Opinion he opposeth, will stand unshaken. We shall now proceed to the Anascheuastical part of his Discourse, and so weigh the strength of his Replies to those Arguments of ours, he is pleased to mention.

CHAP. XIII.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *Answers to those Scriptures which hold forth* [An immediate actual reconciliation of sinners to God, upon the death of Christ, without the intervention of Faith] *are examined.*

THe Texts which he hath cited, as objected against him, are *Matth.*3.17. *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, viz.* With sinners. And *Rom.*5.10. *We were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son.* Which places were not once mentioned in the Conference, that I had with him: The former I alledged in the Discourse which I had with Mr. *Warren* (as hath been shewn before [a]) to which I had added sundry others, had I

[a] Cap.1 sect.8.

not been interrupted by the unſeaſonable (not to ſay, uncivil) interpoſing of this Antagoniſt, who then caſt in the Exceptions, which ſince he hath Printed, with ſome enlargements.

Except. 1. His firſt Exception againſt the force of that Scripture, is, That the wel-pleaſedneſs of God, need not to be extended beyond the perſon of Chriſt, *Who gave himſelf unto death an Offering and Sacrifice unto God, of a ſweet ſmelling favor, Eph.*5.2. Whereunto I anſwer, (1) That he oppoſeth his ſingle opinion againſt the judgement of all the Interpreters that I have ſeen, without one grain of Reaſon to counter-ballance them, as if he were, ἀντὶ πάντων ἀνδρῶν ἄλλων *, or as *David*, 2 *Sam.*18.3. *worth a thouſand*, ſuch as *Calvin, Beza, Pareus, &c.* who do extend it unto all thoſe, for whom Chriſt exhibited himſelf a Mediator. It was the opinion of *Muſculus, Teſtimonium hoc Patris cœlitus terris illatum, declarationem habet voluntatis ejus erga genus humanum* [b], *&c. That this teſtimony of the Father doth manifeſt the Will of God towards mankinde. God* (ſayes *Calvin* [c]) *by this teſtimony which he gave to Chriſt, declares he is a Father unto us all.* And a little after, *Saint* Paul *doth beſt interpret this Text*, Eph.1.6. *where he ſayes, God hath made us accepted in Jeſus Chriſt.* And again, *In this clauſe* [in whom I am wel-pleaſed] *he gives us to underſtand, that his love is ſo great to Chriſt, that from him, it overflows upon us all.* And *Beza* [d] more expreſly, *Significat enim Pater Chriſtum, &c. The Father did hereby ſignifie, that Chriſt is he alone, whom when the Father beholds, he layes aſide all his wrath and indignation, which we deſerved; and that he is the onely Mediator and Reconciler. Which* (ſayes he) *will be better underſtood by comparing this Text with* Exod. 28.38. *where we read, That* Iſrael *was made accepted to God by the High Prieſts appearing for them in the preſence of God; which High Prieſt was undeniably a type of Chriſt. The word* εὐδόκησα (ſaith he) *though in the uſe of Sacred, and other Authors, it hath the ſignification of the Preſent tenſe; yet here it may as fitly be rendered by the time perfectly paſt.* Ut declaret Pater ſe jam eſſe in filio hominibus reconciliatum: *That the Father might declare that he is* already reconciled *to men in his own Son*; he plainly alludes to *Iſai.* 42.1. *Senſus eſt, &c.* (ſaith *Pareus* [e]) *The meaning of*

Anſw.

* Il. λ.

[b] *Muſculus* in loc. apud Marlorat.

[c] *Calv.* Harm. in Mat.3.17.

[d] *Beza* Majores Annot in loc.

[e] *Pareus* in loc.

the

the place is, That this is my Son, for whose sake and merit, I do lay aside all my displeasure against mankinde, and do receive them into favor. This voice doth comprise the whole mystery of our Reconciliation with God, by, and for the sake of Christ. To these we might adde the suffrage of one of our own Countreymen [f], *This voice was uttered in respect of us, because of old God was angry with us for our sins, but now he is reconciled to us by Christ.* And honest *Fernus* (who was more a Protestant in the Doctrine of Justification, then many of ours,) *Hæc verba non Christo dicuntur, sed & nobis, &c. These words were not onely spoken unto Christ, but unto us.* Let him that hath leisure look over more [h].

[f] *Ward* on Matth. 3. 17.

[g] *Ferus* in Matth. 3.

[h] See *Distant* on Matth. 3. 17.

§. 2. (2) It is against the scope of the words to limit them to the person of Christ, they being a solemn declaration of Christs investiture in the glorious office of a Mediator; in which respect he is said to be a *Son given, and born to us, Isa.* 9. And therefore this εὐδοκία of God to men, was at his birth proclaimed by the holy Angels, *Luke* 2. All that grace or favor which at any time was manifested to Christ, as a Mediator, was for their sakes whom he represented, and to whom the benefits of his Mediatorship were intended. See *John* 12.30. That Text *Eph.* 5.2. which Mr. *W.* alledgeth for confining of this voice to the person of Christ, proves nothing less, where the Apostle shews the effect of Christs sacrifice towards us, thus, as when *Noah* offered up his burnt-offerings to God, *The Lord smelled a sweet savor, &c. Gen.* 8. 21. So when Christ offered up himself a sacrifice of atonement, the Lord smelled a savor of rest, and was fully satisfied for the sins of his people. (3) There is no reason can be given, why those words should be terminated to the person of Christ, seeing that God was never displeased with him, nor had our Saviour any doubt, or suspition of it; and therefore it was altogether needless that God should declare his well-pleasedness to him in his own person. (4) The well-pleasedness of God is to be extended unto them, for whom Christ offered up his sacrifice; but Christ did not offer up his sacrifice for himself, but onely for sinners. *Ergo.* Joh. 17. 24, 26.

§. 3. Well, *hac non successit, alia aggrediamur via*: his next Exception therefore is, *That if we should extend it unto men, the* Except. 2.

words prove no more, then that it is through Christ, that God is well pleased with men, whensoever it be that he is well pleased. So that in his sense *I am well pleased*, is as much as I will be well pleased with them, when they have performed the terms and conditions required on their part. A gloss which (I dare say) was never dreamed of by any Expositor before himself. Here (1) let the Reader observe how bold he makes with the Holy Ghost; for when God tells us, *he is well pleased*, to say no, he is not now, but he will hereafter, is not to interpret, but contradict the Scripture. (2) His gloss contradicts it self, for if our reconciliation with God, doth depend upon terms and conditions performed by us, then it is not through Christ alone, that God is well pleased with men, whensoever it is; and Christ is at most but a partial cause of our reconciliation.

§. 4. But to render his Paraphrase more probable, he hath cited divers other places, where (as he pretends) Verbs and Participles of the Present tense have the signification of the future, *Though* (says he) *the Verb in this place be not the Present tense, but the first Aoriſt*; though it be the Aoriſt, what is that to the purpose, seeing (as every School-boy knows) the Aoriſts have the signification of the Preterperfect tense, and not of the Future; and if that enunciation will hold in the Preterperfect tense (as *Beza* grants) then is it much more true in the Present tense. But to his Allegations I answer, (1) That in most of his instances, there is no necessity to feign a change of Tenses, as *John* 4. 25. *Messiah cometh, i. e.* The promise of the Messiah draws nigh to be fulfilled. So *Chap.* 5. 25. *The hour is coming, and now is, &c.* The dead did then hear the voice of the Son of man, both in his own, and in his Disciples Ministery. So 2 *Cor.* 3. 16. the Verbs are most properly rendred in the Present tense, *When* Israel *shall*, or doth *turn unto the Lord, the vail is taken away*; for as *Cameron*[1] notes their Conversion to God, doth not precede the taking away of the vail, but both are at the same time. *Rom.* 8. 24. *By hope we are saved.* The enunciation is true and emphatical in the Present tense; for in many other places the Saints are said *to be saved, and to have eternal life*, whilest they are in the body, *John* 3. 36. & 5. 24. & 6. 54, 56. *Col.* 2. 10. *Eph.* 2. 5, 8. *Tit.* 3. 5. 1 *John* 5. 11, 12. They have here the beginnings, or first

[1] Vid. *Camer.* Myrothe. in 2 Cor. 3. 16. & v. 13. & Piscat. in Mat. 9. 3.

first-fruits of that Salvation; the complement and perfection whereof, they as yet do wait for; they have now the joy and comfort of their Salvation, thorough Faith and Hope, because Hope looks upon the promises of God, not as doubtful but as sure and certain, *Heb.*11.1,2. They are now saved by Hope, or they shall never be saved by Hope, for Hope that is seen, is not Hope; in the world to come they are saved by sight, and not by Faith or Hope: So that Text 1 *Cor.* 15.57. is most properly rendered, *Thanks be unto God that giveth, or hath given us the victory through Jesus Christ.* For the Saints have already obtained victory over death, and the grave, in Christ their Head. *Rom.*8.37. *In all things we are more than conquerors.* And *John* 16.33. *Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.* So *Heb.* 10.35, *Your confidence hath a great recompence of reward,* to wit, In the present effects which it did produce, as inward peace, joy, &c. according to that of the *Psalmist*, *Psal.*19.11. *In keeping thy statutes, there is great reward.* But (2) if I should grant, what he desires, that in all these places there were an Heterosis of Tenses, (for I acknowledge this trope is frequent in Scripture) yet this great flourish will amount to nothing, unless he had shewn by the circumstances of the Text, or the nature of the thing, that it must be so expounded here; for if men had liberty to feign Enalloges of Numbers, Cases, and Tenses, at their pleasure, it were easie to elude the meaning of the plainest Texts.

§.5. (3) Those words, *Heb.*11.6. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God*, do not conclude what he would have them, to wit, That God is not well-pleased with his Elect in Christ, before they do believe; for the Apostle speaks there of mens works, and actions, and not of their persons. No man can please God without Faith, no not Believers themselves; their Religious Services are not pleasing to God, unless they are done in Faith, for *bonum est ex causa integra* [k]. Now Faith is a principal ingredient in the Saints obedience; for if it be not done in Faith, it is not done in love, *Gal.*5 6. And consequently it is not *fruit unto God*, *Rom* 7.4. Gods well-pleasedness with his Elect, is the immediate effect of the death of Christ, for that which raised a partition wall between God and them, was the breach of the Law; now when the Law was satisfied for their sins, this partition was broken down,

[k] *Byonif.* de div. nom. part 4. circa med.

down, his favor had as free a current, as if they had not sinned: And therefore the blotting out of our sin, and our reconciliation with God, is ascribed, solely, and immediately to the death of Christ, as in many other Scriptures, so particularly, *Ephes.* 1. 6, 7. & 2. 13, 14. *Col.* 1. 20, 21. & 2. 13, 14. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*; he did not only act towards it, as Mr. *W.* glosseth those words in his Sermon, but (saith the Text) *he did not impute their sins unto them*: for whom Christ died. *The actual blotting out of sin* (saies Mr. *Perkins*[1]) *doth inseparably depend upon satisfaction for sins, and satisfaction with God doth necessarily imply the very real and general abolishment of the guilt and punishment of sin.* That which makes our persons acceptable to God, is the Righteousnes of Jesus Christ; but now our actions are not pleasing, unless they are conformable to the rule, and all necessary circumstances do concur; the cheif whereof, is Faith in the propitiation and atonement of Jesus Christ, whereby their defects and obliquities are done away[m].

[1] Vol. 1. p. 110. Edit. 1608.

[m] Levit. 17. 4. 1 Pet. 2. 5.

§. 6. (4) Whereas he addes, *That it was a poor answer which I gave to Mr.* Good, [*That God was well pleased with his Elect, whilest unregenerate, though not with their unregeneracy.*] 1. As for as it concerns my self, I shall subscribe to his censure, *I am poor, but he is rich*, I am empty, but he is full[n]. But 2. he may be pleased to take notice, that a far richer man then himself, in all kinde of learning, both Humane and Divine, hath given the very same answer unto this question. Mr. *Pemble*[o] distinguisheth between *Gods love to our persons, and Gods love to our qualities and actions: A distinction which* (saies he) *parents are well skilled in, who put a difference between the vices, and persons of their children; those they hate, these they love, even when for their vices they do chastise their persons. The case* (saies he) *is the same between God and the Elect, his love to their persons, is from everlasting the same; nor doth their sinfulnes lessen it, nor their sanctity increase it, because God in loving their persons, never considered them otherwise, then as most perfectly holy, and unblameable in Jesus Christ, &c.* It is a strange inference which he draws from my words, *That because I said, God is well pleased with the persons of his Elect, whilest*

[n] 1 Cor. 4 8.

[o] Vind. Grat. p. 19.

whilest unregenerate, that afterwards he is well pleased with their unregeneracy also: He might as well impose this absurdity upon the Prophet, that because he saith, *Ezek.* 16. 8. *Thy time* (to wit, of unregeneracy) *was the time of love.* Surely not of their unregeneracy, but of their persons then unregenerate, that therefore the Prophet supposeth, that after their Conversion God did love their unregeneracy, or that corruption of nature, which remained in them. Such quibbles are unbeseeming serious Christians.

§. 7. I shall adde but a word to clear up the difference between the actions of regenerate and unregenerate persons; And first, we say that the best actions of unregenerate men are impure and sinful, which though they are pardoned unto all the Elect for the sake of Christ, yet they are not acceptable to God, but in themselves most abominable and loathsome in his sight, *Prov.* 5. 8. *Tit.* 1. 15. *Isai.* 1. 13, *&c.* Secondly, Though (as the Orthodox acknowledge) the best works of the best men, have not in them that Inherent purity and holiness, which can stand before God without the mediation of their High Priest [p], yet they may be said to be acceptable and pleasing unto God, not onely comparatively, because they are better then the works of unregenerate men, or then the sinful works of such as are regenerate; but absolutely, and that two ways. 1. Abstractly and in themselves, or as they ought to be done; and thus Faith, Hope, Love, *&c.* are acceptable to God, for they are that spiritual worship and service which God looks for, and delights in, *Joh.* 4. 23. *Micah* 6. 8. *Gal.* 5. 5, 6. *Phil.* 3. 3. And in this respect, *a meek and a quiet spirit*, is said to be *of great price in the sight of God*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 4. 2. Concretely as they are acted by us, or do pass through our hands, and so they are acceptable to God, as they are washed and cleansed in the blood of Christ, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. Our spiritual sacrifices are made acceptable to God in Jesus Christ, or by his taking away the sin and defilement, that adheres unto them [q]: Our High Priest doth not procure the acceptance of those works, which in their whole abstract nature, are sinful, such as are all our works before Conversion, and the fruits of the flesh after Conversion, he obtains forgiveness, but not acceptance for them: But now those works which come from the Spirit of God, and are sinful onely through

[p] *Pronunciant Catholici nullam dari in hac vita hominis peccatoris sanctificationem tantam ut non habeat admixtum peccatum, & longe absit à perfectione ad quam tendit.* Chamier. tom. 3. l. 10. c. 3. sect. 9. + *Vide etiam laudabili vitæ hominum, si remota misericordia discutias eam.* Aug. Confes. l. 9. c. 13. See Dr. *Reynolds* on 2 Cor. 7. 1: p. 325.

[q] Exod. 28. 38. Apoc. 8. 3, 4.

the mixture of our corruptions (as ſweet water which paſſeth through a ſink) theſe he makes acceptable to the Father, by taking away the imperfections and defilements that adhere unto them.

§. 8. The next Scripture which Mr. *W.* hath brought in, by way of objection againſt himſelf, is, *Rom.* 5. 10. *When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* To which he anſwers, *That Chriſt's death was the price of our reconciliation, and ſo it is through the death of Chriſt that we are reconciled, be it when it will be that we are reconciled.* Againſt this anſwer of his, I ſhall offer theſe Exceptions. (1) It offers a manifeſt violence to the Text, to ſay, *That we were reconciled,* is as much as *we ſhall be reconciled* when we have performed the terms and conditions required of us. (2) If our reconciliation to God, did depend upon terms and conditions performed by us, then is it not through the death of Chriſt that we are reconciled unto God; we ſhould be more the cauſe of our reconciliation, then Chriſt is; for he that performs a condition, to which a benefit is promiſed, doth more to the procuring of it, then he that makes or obtains that conditional grant; notwithſtanding which, he is never a whit the near of the benefit, unleſs his own act do concur. (3) The Apoſtle declares, That this reconciliation was made when we were enemies; *Ergo*, Before our believing, or the fulfilling of any condition on our part: For Believers are not enemies. (4) If his meaning were no more then this, that it is through the death of Chriſt, that we are reconciled, be it when it will, that we are reconciled; then this clauſe [*when we were enemies*] would be ſuperfluous and redundant; whereas the main emphaſis of the Text doth lie therein, as is evident from the gradation which the Apoſtle makes, *Verſ.* 6, 8, 10. (5) The Apoſtle in 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. affirms, That our Saviour did not onely pay the price of our reconciliation, but that God did ſo far accept of, or acquieſce therein, that upon the payment of it, he did not impute our ſins unto us, *i. e.* he juſtified us; for the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4. defines Juſtification to be the *non-imputation of ſin.* (6) And laſtly, That which he grants, yeelds the matter in queſtion, *viz.* The immediate actual reconciliation of ſinners upon the death of Chriſt; for if Chriſt by ſhedding of his blood, paid the total and full price,

for

for our deliverance from the curse of the Law, then were we actually set free from the obligation of it; for when the debt is paid, the debtor is free in Law; it is unjust to implead a person for a debt which is paid.

§. 9. Secondly, To illustrate and confirm his Answer, he makes use of [r] *Grotius* his distinction of three moments, or periods of the Will of God; (1) at Enmity, (2) Appeasable, (3) Appeased. 1. *Before the consideration of the death of Christ, God* (saith he) *is at enmity with the sinner, though not averse from all ways and means of reconciliation.* 2. *After the consideration of the death of Christ; and now is the Lord not onely appeasable, but doth also promise that he will be reconciled with sinners, upon such terms as he himself shall propose.* 3. *After Intercession on Christs part, and Faith on the sinners part; and now is God actually reconciled, and in friendship with the sinner.* This Grotian and Vorstian Divinity is monstrous grosse, which renders God as changable as a fickle Creature, and palpably denies his God-like nature, *scil.* His Simplicity, Eternity, Omniscience, Immutability, *&c.* *Arminius* himself [s] was more modest, then to affirm a change in the Will of God; nay, *Plato* [t] was a more Orthodox Divine in this point, who said, *That the first mover can be moved of none, but by himself.* The Will of God is not inclined or moved by any thing without him, unto any of his acts, whether Immanent or Transient; for that which is the cause of his Will, is the cause of himself; seeing that his Will, is his Essence. The death of Christ doth not cause any alteration in the Will of God [u]; his Merits are not the cause, why God doth love us, or will to us the blessings of his Covenant, they did not change God, *ex nolente in volentem, ex odio habente in diligentem* [x], as *Greevenchovius* dreamed: And the Reasons are, (1) Because God is unchangable, he neither ceaseth to will what at any time he intended, nor doth he begin to will what he did not always purpose: (2) Because no reason can be given of the Will of God, *Aquinas* says well, *Nullum temporale* [y], *&c.* Nothing that hath its being in time, can be the cause of that which is eternal, for then the effect should be before the cause. Now that I may not *actum agere*, I shall desire the Reader to consult what Mr. *Owen* [z] hath said in answer to this notion of *Grotius*; whereof, if

[r] *Grot.* de Satisf. c. 7. p. 154. Oxon.

[s] *Armin.* disp. pub. de Nat. Dei. Thes 51.

[t] Vid. *Aquin.* p. 1. q. 19. art. 2. ad 3. & art. 5. in c.

[u] Vid. *Twiss.* Vind. Grat. l. 1. p. 2. digres. 1, 2, 3.

[x] *Rhetor. f.* Apol. c. 2. n. 16.

[y] *Aquin.* l. p. q. 23. art 5. in c.

[z] Answ. to *Baxter*, c. 6. p. 36.

Mr. *W.* had vouchsafed to take any notice, he might have seen cause enough to decline from the steps of his admired *Grotius*.

§. 10. Thirdly, he infers, That because the Apostle saith, *Vers.* 11. *We have now received the atonement, or reconciliation*, Ergo, *Not before we believed*. To which I answer, (1) He might as well reason, that because the Apostle saith, 1 *Cor.* 15. 20. *Now is Christ risen*, *Ergo*, He was not risen before he writ that Epistle; and from *Eph.* 2. 2. The Spirit that now worketh in the children of unbelief, *Ergo*, He did not work in them before. (2) If it be referred to our receiving, or apprehension by Faith, it doth not prove, that the reconciliation or atonement was not made before. There is a wide difference between the making or obtaining of reconciliation and our receiving of it; though we cannot receive or apply it to our selves any otherwise then by Faith, yet it follows not, That God did not account it unto us before. The Typical Sacrifices made a present atonement, much more the real, see *Heb.* 9. 14.

§. 11. Fourthly, He gives us his opinion concerning the immediate effect of the death of Christ, *Which* (saith Mr. *Baxter*) *is one of the greatest and nablest questions in our controverted Divinity; he that can rightly answer this, is a Divine indeed.* And no doubt but Mr. *W.* deserves the Bell in his account. Let us therefore see what a glorious atcheivement he ascribes unto it. *It is* (saith he) *through the death of Christ, that the promise of reconciliation is made, by, and according to which, we are actually reconciled unto God after we do believe*; to wit, at the day of judgement, when we have performed that, and all other conditions required of us; which in sum, is, as if he had said, *That the death of Christ procured no certain or immediate effect at all*: For notwithstanding his death, it is possible that none may be saved; for things obtained under condition, are as to their accomplishment altogether uncertain; for the condition may be fulfilled, or it may not be fulfilled. The utmost which hereby is ascribed to the death of Christ, is, That he hath obtained a salvability for sinners, or a way whereby they may become their own saviours; which in the old Popish English is, That Christ hath merited that we might merit Eternal life, or as the Remonstrants have refined the phrase, His death hath made God *placabilem*, but not *placatum*. *A shift* (says *Pemble*) *devised meerly to uphold the liber-*

ty,

ty of mans will, and universal Redemption. Whereunto the abettors of this notion do hie them apace.

§. 12. But against it, I shall oppose these considerations. (1) The Scripture no where ascribes this effect to the death of Christ, That he died to obtain a conditional grant, that we by performing the condition, might be reconciled to God, but to obtain peace and reconciliation it self. *Daniel* doth not say that Messiah shall be cut off to obtain a promise, *but to make an end of sin, &c. Chap.* 9. 24. Nor the Apostle, that Christ *by the blood of the cross*, hath obtained a conditional promise of reconciliation, but that *he hath made peace*, Col. 1. 20. *broken down the partition wall*, Ephes. 2. 14. *delivered us from the curse*, *Gal.* 3. 13. And our Saviour in that of *Matth.* 26. 28. (which Mr. *W.* cites) doth not say, That he shed his blood to procure a conditional promise, whereby all men may obtain remission; but *for the remission of the sins of many*, *i. e.* of all the Elect. (2) If Christ by his death obtained onely a conditional promise, then was his death no more available to the Elect, then unto Reprobates, no more to *Peter*, then it was to *Judas*; whereas the Scripture shews us, That the effects of Christs death are peculiar onely to the Elect. See *John* 10. 15, 16, 26. & 17. 9, 20. (3) If Christ by his death obtained but a conditional promise, then do men more for their Salvation, then Christ hath done; for he that performs the condition, doth more to his Salvation, then he that obtained the conditional promise; notwithstanding which, he might have perished. (4) It makes Christ to have died in vain, at least, without any determinate end, in reference unto them, for whom he died; seeing that notwithstanding his death, it was possible, that none at all might be saved. *And thus* (as Mr. *Owen* hath noted [a]) *he is made a Surety of an uncertain Covenant, a Purchaser of an Inheritance perhaps never to be enjoyed, a Priest sanctifying none by his Sacrifice*; a thing we would not ascribe to a wiseman in a far more easie undertaking. If Mr. *W.* shall say, that Christ is certain, that the Elect will perform the condition required, we shall demand whether this certainty doth arise from their wills, or his will. If he say from their wills, and his fore-sight of their well using of their natural abilities to fulfil the condition required, he shakes hands with Papists and Arminians, who make our Election and Redemption to be *ex*

[a] Answer to Baxter, p. 85.

praevisa fide: A conceit that hath been confuted over and over; if from his own will, because he hath purchased Faith for them, then he obtained more by his death, then a conditional promise.

§.13. Fifthly, The ground whereon he builds these Assertions, is a very sandy foundation, to wit, That the death of Christ was not *solutio ejusdem*, but *tantidem*; not the payment of that which was in the obligation, but of something equivalent; and therefore it doth not deliver us *ipso facto*, but according to the compact and agreement between the Father and him. I answer, (1) Whether the death of Christ be *solutio ejusdem*, or *tantidem*, as it is a satisfaction or payment of a debt, so the discharge thereby procured, must needs be present and immediate; for that a debt should be paid and satisfied, and yet justly chargeable, implies a contradiction. But (2) Mr. *W.* might have thought we would expect a better proof then his bare word, That the death of Christ is not *solutio ejusdem*, seeing the Holy Ghost shews, First, That Christ was held in the same obligation, which we were under, *He was made under the Law*, not an other, but the very same that we were held in, *Gal.*4.3,4. *Ergo*, he paid the same debt that we did ow. Secondly, That *the Curse*, or punishment which we deserved, *was inflicted upon him*, *Gal.*3.13. The whole wages or curse that is due to sin, is Death; and this Christ under-went for us, *Heb.*2.9,14. *Isai.*53.4,5. What is it to die, or to bear chastisement for another, but to undergo that death which the other should have undergone? If it be objected, That the death which we deserved, is Eternal, such as the damned endure; our Divines have answered long ago, That Christs death was such *in pondere*, though not *in specie*, *in potentia*, though not *in actu*: The dignity of his person raised the price of his temporary sufferings to an equipollency with the other. Mr. *Owen* [b] says well, That there is a sameness in Christs sufferings with that in the obligation in respect of Essence, and equivalency in respect of the Adjuncts or Attendencies. Thirdly, *The laying of our sins upon Christ*, *Isai.*53.6. subjected him to the same punishment which our sins deserved. Fourthly, If God would have dispenced with the *idem* in the first obligation, Christ need not have died; for if the justice of God would have been satisfied with less then that penalty threatned in the

[b] Ib.p.30.

the Law, he might as well have dispenced with the whole: So then his inference, That the death of Christ doth not deliver us *ipso facto*, (being destitute of this support) will fall to the ground of its own accord.

§. 14. *M. W.* grants, *That if the debtor himself do bring unto the creditor, that which he owe him, it presently dischargeth him, but the payment of a Surety doth not.* And why not? Amongst men there is no difference, so the debt be paid, it matters not, whether it be by the Principal, or his Surety, the obligation is voide in respect of both: The case is the very same between Christ and us. Secondly, This Exception makes the payment of Christ, less efficacious for the discharge of our debt, then if it had been made by us, whereas it is infinitely more acceptable to God, then the most perfect righteousnes performed by us.

But (saies he) the payment of a Surety is refusable. Not after that he is admitted by the creditor, and taken into Bond with, or for the principal debtor. It is true, God might have refused to be satisfied for our debt by a Surety; but seeing he ordained his Son to be our Surety, and entered into Covenant with him from everlasting, to accept his payment on our behalf; the debt which he hath fully satisfied, cannot be charged again, either upon the Party, or Surety, without manifest injustice.

But the Father and the Son have agreed between themselves, that none should have actual reconciliation by the death of Christ, till they do believe. Shew us this agreement, and we will yeeld the cause. As for the Scriptures which he hath mentioned, they speak of no such thing, *John* 6.40. *This is the will of him that sent me, That every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life.* This Text, and others like it, do onely shew who have the fruition and enjoyment of the benefits of Christ, to wit, they that believe. The other Text, *Gal.* 5. 2,4. is palpably abused to serve his turn. The Apostle doth not say, Without Faith Christ shall profit us nothing, but if we joyn any thing with Christ as necessary to attain Salvation, we are not Believers, or true Christians, our profession of Christ shall profit us nothing; and the reason hereof is, because these two principles cannot be mixed[c]. A mans righteousnes before God, is either all by Works, or all by Christ; and therefore,

[c] See Dicd. on Gal 5.2.

fore, whosoever attributes any part thereof to Works, he wholly renounceth Christ. At the sixth Verse he attributes that to Faith, which he denies unto other Works. *In Christ Jesus* (saith he) *neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth any thing, but Faith which worketh by love.* But as the Godly learned [d] have well observed, the intent of the Apostle here, was not to shew what it is that doth justifie, but what are the Exercises of Divine Worship, in which Christians should be conversant. He doth not say, That Faith working by love, is available to us before God, or in the sight of God, *but in Christ*, *i. e.* In the Church [e], or Kingdom of Christ, which consists in Righteousness, Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost; though neither Faith, nor Love, are available to justifie us, yet they are available, *i. e.* Acceptable to God as acts or duties of Spiritual Obedience, they are the onely acceptable service which we can perform to God. The last place he hath mentioned, is as little to the purpose, as the rest, 1 *Joh.* 5.11. *He that hath not the Son, hath not life.* True! he doth not say, That all who have not Faith (except final unbelievers) have not the Son, or any benefit by him.

[d] Vid. *Perk.* & *Calv.* in loc.

[e] *Sarcer.* apud Marlorat. in loc. & *Perkins.*

§. 15. *But* (says Mr. *W.*) *if our Adversaries could prove, That it was either the Will of God in giving his Son, or the Will of Christ in giving himself to the death, that his death should be available to the immediate and actual reconciliation of sinners, without any condition performed on their part, it were something to the purpose; but till this be done (which indeed can never be done) they were as good say nothing.* Had not prejudice cast a mist before his eyes, the Scriptures which have been brought already, would be proof sufficient. What clearer Testimony can be desired of the Will of God, and of Christ in this point, then those Sacred Oracles which shew us, First, That Christ by the Will of God, gave himself a Ransom and Sacrifice of a sweet smelling savor unto God, in behalf of all the Elect, *Joh.*6.27. *Heb.*5.10. & 10.9,10. Secondly, That this Ransom was alone, and by it self, a full adequate and perfect satisfaction to Divine Justice, for all their sins, *Heb.* 1.3. & 10.10, 12, 14. 1 *Joh.* 1.7. Thirdly, That God accepted it, and declared himself well pleased and satisfied therewith, *Matth.* 3.17. *Isa.* 42. 1. Insomuch, that God hath thereupon covenanted and sworn,

sworo, that he will never *remember their sins*, nor *be wrath with them any more*, Isa. 43. 25. & 44. 22. Fourthly, That by this Ransom of his, they are freed and delivered from the curse of the Law, Gal. 4. 4. & 3. 13. Our Adversaries say, That he paid the price for their Redemption; but with no intent that they should be immediately and absolutely freed[4]; which is often, boldly affirmed, and as slenderly proved. But why not immediately and absolutely? *There is* (saith Mr. W.) *a compact and agreement between the Father and the Son, when he undertook to be our Surety, that his death should not be available for the actual reconciliation of sinners, till they have performed the terms and conditions required on their part. Sed hoc rest is probandum*; and I am perswaded will, till the worlds end. Let them shew us this Covenant and Agreement, and we are satisfied; till this be done, we shall think our proofs sufficient; and that the force of those Allegations is no whit invalidated by this Crude Assertion. I confess I have heard much talk of this Suspensive Covenant, but hitherto I have not had the hap to meet with that Author, that hath attempted to make it forth; though I might justly be excused from the labor of proving the Negative, seeing that it lies upon our Adversaries to clear it up. *That there was such a compact and agreement made between the Father and the Son, that his death should not be available to the immediate reconciliation of sinners, but only upon conditions performed by them.* Yet because I intend not any other Reply, and that Mr. W. may see I do not dissent, because he hath said, and not proved it; which in controverted points, were ground enough; I shall offer him the Reasons, which as yet do sway my Judgement to believe the contrary.

[4] Baxters Append. p. 152.

T CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Covenant between the Father and the Son, concerning the immediate effects of Christs death.

THe Reasons which perswade me to believe, *That there was not any Covenant passed between God and Christ, to hinder the immediate and actual reconciliation of Gods Elect by his death, and to suspend the effect thereof, upon terms and conditions to be performed by them; but contrariwise, that it was the will both of God and of Christ, that his death should be available to their immediate and actual Reconciliation and Justification, without any condition performed on their part,* Are, as followeth.

First, There is no such Covenant doth appear, *Ergo*, there is none. *Non est Scriptum, Ergo*, There is no such thing, hath hitherto been counted a good Argument amongst Christians. It is not possible (says *Damascene* [a]) *ἐκεῖθεν τι μὴ ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν δείκνυσθαι, &c. To speak ought of God, beside the things which are divinely manifested in the Old and New Testament.* If there be any such Covenant, let our Adversaries shew it, and until they do, we shall rest securely in the Negative; they must pardon us, if we yeeld not up our Faith to unwritten Verities [b].

[a] *Damasc.* de fid. Orthod. l. 1. c. 2. & *Iod. Clichtov.* in loc.

[b] *Omnes sciant, neminì quicquam, quàm quod scriptis probaverit, esse credendum.* Cod. l. 1. Tit. 18. leg. unic. *Grat. Valentinian.* & l. 3. Tit. 1. leg. 3. *constant.*

Secondly, The Covenant made between God and Christ, was, *That upon giving up of himself to death, he should purchase a Seed like the Stars of Heaven, i. e.* All the Elect of God, *Isa.* 53.10. And our *Saviour Christ* after that he *had tasted death to bring many sons unto glory*, boasts and glories in this atchievement. *Heb.* 2. 13. *Behold, I and the children, whom God hath given me. Ergo*, It was the Will of God, that his death should be available for their immediate reconciliation; for they could not be the children of Christ, and the children of wrath at the same time.

§. 2. Thirdly, If it were the Will of God, that the death of Christ, should be the payment of our debt, and a full satisfaction for

for all our iniquities, then was it his Will that our discharge procured thereby, should be immediate; but it was the Will of God, that the death of Christ should be the payment of our debts, and a full satisfaction for our iniquities. *Ergo.* I suppose the Assumption will not be questioned; for though the word satisfaction be not used in Scripture*, yet the thing it self is plainly signified in those phrases of Redemption, Atonement, Reconciliation; and in like manner, all those places which declare that *Christ died for us*, and *for our sins*, and *offences*, do imply the same; *scil.* That the death of Christ, was the payment of *our debts*, and the punishment of *our sins*; that thereby he satisfied the Law for all those wrongs, & injuries we have done unto it. Now the Sequel is evident, If God willed, that the death of Christ should be a full and satisfactory payment of our demerits, then he willed that the discharge procured thereby, should be immediate and present; for it is contrary to Justice and Equity, that a debt when it is payed, should be charged either upon the Surety or Principal; and therefore though God did will, that the other effects of Christs death, as it is the meritorious price of Faith, Holiness, Glory, *&c.* should be *sub termino*, or *in Diem*, not Present but Future; yet he willed, that this effect of it, to wit, our discharge from sin, and the curse, should be present and immediate; because it implies a contradiction, that the same debt should be paid, and not paid; that it should be discharged, and yet justly chargable: As when a man that is a Trespasser, or any one for him, payes a sum of money, which is sufficient both for discharge of his trespass, as also for the purchase of a peece of Land: From the trespass his discharge must be present, if the satisfaction be full, though the enjoyment of the Land may be *in Diem*, as the Vendee and Purchaser can agree; the Case before us, is the very same. The death of Christ was both a price and a ransom, it served both to pay our debts, and to procure our happiness; he did thereby purchase both our deliverance from sin and death, and all those Spiritual Blessings, present and future, which we stand in need of. The discharge of our debts, and deliverance from punishment, must needs be present and immediate upon the payment of the price, though those Spiritual Blessings be not received till a long time after, as God and Christ shall see it fit to bestow them on us. To this I shall adde a fourth.

* See *Bull* of the Covenant. p. 236, &c.

§. 3. Fourthly, If nothing hindered the reconciliation of the Elect with God, but the breach of the Law, then the Law being satisfied, it was the Will of God that they should be immediately reconciled; but nothing hindred their reconciliation with God, but the breach of the Law. *Ergo.* It was sin alone that made a distance, or *separation between God and them, Isa.* 59. 2. For which cause it is compared to *a cloud or mist, Isa.* 44. 22. to a partition wall, *Ephes.* 2. 14. It lay as a block in the way, that God could not (*salva justitia*) bestow upon them those good things intended towards them in his Eternal Election. The onely cause of Christs death was to satisfie the Law; he did not die to procure a new Will or Affection in the heart of God towards his Elect, nor yet to adde any new thing in God, which doth perfect and compleat the act of Election, as *Wallæus* seems to intimate[d]: But that God might save us in a way agreeable to his own Justice, that he might confer upon us all those Blessings he intended, without wrong and violation to his holy Law; for God having made a Law, that the soul which sinneth, should die, the Justice and Truth of God required, that satisfaction should be made for the sins of the Elect, no less then of other men; which, they being unable to perform, the Son of God became their Surety, to bear the Curse, and fulfil the Law in their stead. God might will unto us sundry benefits, which he cannot actually bestow upon us without wrong to his Justice: As a King may will and purpose the deliverance of his Favorite, who is imprisoned for debt, yet he cannot actually free him, till he hath paid and satisfied his Creditor. So though God had an irrevocable, peremptory Will to save his Elect; yet he could not actually save them, till satisfaction was made unto his Justice, which being made, there is no let or impediment to stop the current of his Blessings. As when the Cloud is dissolved, the Sun shines forth; when the partition wall is broken down, they that were separated, are again united: So the cloud of our sins being blotted out, the beams of Gods love have as free a passage towards us, as if we had not sinned. Now that Christ by his death removed this let and hinderance, the Scripture is as express as can be desired, as that *he made an end of sin, Dan.* 9. 24. *Blotted it out, &c.* Col. 2. 14[e]. *Took it quite away,* (as the Scape-goat, *Levit.* 16. 22.) *John* 1. 29. *And slew the enmity between.*

[d] Apud *Rhetorf.* Apol. p. 39.

[e] *Diodate* on Col. 2. 14.

between God and us, *Ephes.* 2. 16. See *Verses* 13, 14, 15.

§. 4. Fifthly, If it were the Will of God, that the sin of *Adam* should immediately over-spread his posterity, then it was his Will that the Satisfaction and Righteousness of Christ, should immediately redound to the benefit of Gods Elect; for there is the same reason for the immediate transmission of both, to their respective subjects [f]; for (as the Apostle shews, *Rom.* 5. 14.) both of them were heads and roots of mankinde. Now the sin of *Adam* did immediately over-spread his posterity; *All men sinned in him, before ever they committed any actual sin*, *Rom.* 5. 12, 14. And therefore the Righteousness of Christ descended immediately upon all the Elect for their Justification, *Rom.* 5. 17, 18.

[f] Vid. Sup. cap. 1. sect. 6.

Sixthly, If the Sacrifices of the Law were immediately available for the Typical cleansing of sin under that administration, then the Sacrifice which Christ hath offered was immediately available, to make a real atonement for all those sins for which he suffered. The reason of the consequence, is, because the Real Sacrifice is not less efficacious, then the Typical, *Heb.* 9. 14. But those Legal Sacrifices did immediately make atonement, without any condition performed on the sinners part, *Levit.* 16. 30.

§. 5. Seventhly, If it be the Will of God that the death of Christ should be available, for the immediate reconciliation of some of the Elect, without any condition performed by them, then it was his Will, that it should be so for all of them; the reason is, because the Scripture makes no difference between persons in the communication of this Grace, *The free gift* (saith the Apostle) *came upon all men*, i. e. *In omnes prædestinatos* [*], *to Justification of life*, to wit, by the gracious imputation of God. But it is the Will of God, that the death of Christ should be available for the immediate reconciliation of some of the Elect, without conditions performed by them, *viz.* To Elect Infants, or else they are not reconciled, and consequently they cannot be saved.

[*] *August.*

Now if any shall say, That God hath a peculiar way of reconciling and justifying Infants, or of communicating unto them the Benefits of Christs death; let them clear it up from Scripture; let them shew us the Text that saith, God gives Salvation unto Infants in one manner, and to men in another; to the one freely, and

to the others, upon conditions. If they say, Infants have the Seed, or Habit of Faith, the Scripture will contradict them, which affirmeth, (1) That they have *no knowledge at all, either of good or evil*, Deut. 1. 39. *And that they cannot* so much as *discern, between the right, and the left hand.* And if so, how can they, who conceive not of things Natural, understand those things that are Heavenly and Spiritual? And therefore (saies *Augustine*[g]) *If we should go about to prove, that Infants know the things of God, who as yet know not the things of men, our own senses would confute us. And can there be Faith without knowledge?* (2) That *Faith cometh by hearing of the Word Preached.* Rom. 10. Now Infants either hear not, or if they do, they understand not what they hear: We have sufficient experience, that no Children give any testimony of Faith, until they have been taught and instructed. Elect Children (which are afterwards manifested to be such) are as obstinate and unteachable as any others: As for the instance of the Baptist, that he believed in his Mothers belly, because it is said, *Luke* 1. 41. *That he was filled with the Holy Ghost, &c.* it doth not prove it; for (as one observes[h]) it is not said, *Credidit in utero*, but onely, *exultavit*, which exultation or springing, *Divinitùs facta est in Infante, non humanitùs ab Infante*; And therefore it is not to be drawn into an example, or urged as a rule to us, what to think of other Infants. But if any shall say, that Infants do perform the conditions of Reconciliation and Salvation by their Parents; then it will follow, That all the Children of believing Parents, are reconciled and justified, because they perform the conditions, as much for all, as they do for one: But I suppose no man will say, That all the Children of believing Parents are justified; we may as well assert works of supererogation, as that one is justified by anothers Faith[i]. That any Infants are saved, it is meerly from the Grace of Election, and the free imputation of Christs Righteousness; of which, all that are elected, are made partakers in the same manner.

[g] Epist. 57.

[h] *Downs* of the Faith of Infants, p. 199.

[i] Ezek. 18. 20. Hab. 2. 4.

§. 6. Eighthly, If it were the Will of God, that Christ should have the whole glory of our reconciliation; it was his will that it should not in the least depend upon our works or conditions; because that condition, or conditions will share with him in the glory of this effect; and our Justification would be partly of Grace, and

and partly of Works; partly from Christ, and partly from our selves: Nay, it would bee more from our selves, then from Jesus Christ; seeing, that notwithstanding all that he hath done for us, we had been eternally miserable, unlesse we had also contributed our owne endeavours. How derogatory this is to Christ, and contrary to the Scriptures is sufficiently manifest.

Ninthly, If it were the Will of God that his people should have *strong consolations* [k], *and that their joy should be full* [l], then it was his Will that their peace and reconciliation, should not depend upon termes and conditions performed by themselves. For (as was noted before out of *Calvin* [m]) it is impossible that any soule should injoy a firme and settled peace, whose confidence towards God is grounded upon conditionall promises; and, sayes the Apostle, our Salvation is *by grace, to the end that the promise might be sure unto all the seed*; implying, that if it depended never so little upon our works, wee could not bee sure thereof, and consequently, wee must *walke in darkenesse and see no light.*

[k] Heb. 6. 18.
[l] 1 Joh. 1. 4.
[m] Sup. cap. 4.
Rom. 4. 16.

Tenthly, If it were the Will of God that the death of Christ should be available for the reconciliation of his Elect, whilst they live in this world, then it was his Will that it should procure for them immediate, and actuall reconciliation without the intervention of those conditions supposed to be required of them; and the reason of this consequence is, because they cannot performe all the conditions required of them till their last breath, this being, that they must persevere to the end; and the nature of conditionall grants is such, that the benefit cannot be had, and injoyed, till all the conditions are performed: So that if the reconciliation of the Elect, did depend upon the conditions pretended, they should not only not have reconciliation before Faith, but not before death; which is contrary to innumerable Scriptures, which doe declare that the Saints are perfectly justified, and so immutably reconciled unto God, that nothing shall be able to separate them from his love; though their Sanctification be imperfect, yet their Justification is as full and perfect as ever it shall be; it doth not grow and increase as the other doth, but is perfect at first [n]: And therefore Baptisme which seals unto us the forgivenesse and washing away of all our sins, not originall only, but actuall also, is administred

[n] See *Hildersh.* on Psa. 51. lect. 128. *Amef.* med. l. 1. c. 27.

nistred but once in all our life time; to shew that our Justification is done all at once, at the very first instant, wherein the righteousnesse of Christ is imputed to us, *Ezek.* 16.8,9. *Act.* 13.39. 1 *Joh.* 1.7. *Col.* 2.13,14.

§.8. Eleventhly, If it were the Will of God that the death of Christ should certainly and infallibly procure the reconciliation of his Elect, then surely it was not the Will of God that it should depend upon terms and conditions on their part; because that which depends upon future conditions, is, as to the event, altogether uncertain °, it is possible it may never be, by the non-performance of the condition. But this hath been alleadged before.

° *Omnis conditio in casu incertum tendit.*

Twelfthly, If God willed this blessing to his Elect by the death of Christ, but conditionally; then he willed their Reconciliation and Justification, no more then their non-Reconciliation, and Condemnation; and stood as it were indifferent to either event; but doubtlesse his heart was more set upon it then so: see *John* 6. 38,39. *John* 17. 21, 22,24. The consequence is cleare, for if he willed their Justification onely in case they should beleeve, and repent; then he willed their Damnation in case they doe not beleeve, and repent; and then it will follow that he willed their Justification, no more then their Damnation; nay, most probably; he willed it lesse, because we are more prone to Infidelity, then we are to Faith; and to hardnesse of heart, then, we are to repentance. I adde to this.

§. 9. Thirteenthly, If God willed unto men the benefits of Christs death upon any condition to be performed by them, it will follow that God foresaw in them an ability to performe some good, which Christ hath not merited. Conditionall reconciliation necessarily supposeth Free-will. For either God willed it unto men upon a possible, or impossible condition; not upon an impossible condition, for that is inconsistent with the Wisdome of God; if upon a possible condition, the possibility thereof ariseth either from Gods Will, or from Mans; it is possible, either because God will bestow it, or because man can performe it. Our adversaries, cannot mean it in the former sence, for God will bestow upon us nothing, but what Christ hath purchased; and Christ hath purchased nothing, save what God hath promised in his Covenant. Now Mr. *W.* denyes that the promise of Faith *is any part of the Covenant*

venant, or any effect of it, p. 32. and others that are for this conditional reconciliation, look upon it as a ridiculous conceit?, that God should promise men Salvation upon a condition, and that he should work this condition in them, and for them; so that in the upshot, we shall be beholding chiefly to Free Will, an opinion so absurd that in all ages it hath been exploded by humble and sober minded Christians, it being palpably contrary to the Scriptures which shew that every man by nature *is without strength, dead in trespasses and sins, that we cannot so much as think a good thought, that it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.* If any shal say that God did will that by Christ wee should have Faith, and after that, reconciliation; Though this be granted them, it will follow notwithstanding, that our reconciliation is an immediate effect of the death of Christ (as Mr. *Owen* hath invincibly proved in his answer to *Baxter*. p. 34.) and then all the controversie will be about Gods order and method in conferring on us the effects of Christs death; and whether God doth enable a man to perform good works, before his person is reconciled to God. Some Reasons for the Negative have been given before.

? *Ante conditionem quis serio & sapienter prescribet alteri sub promisso premii, & pœna grevissima comminatione, qui eam in eo cui prescribit efficere velit, hæc actio tua audiens, & vix fœna digna est,* Rem Apol. c. 9. p. 105. a. *Nihil ineptius, nihil vanius quam fidem merito Christi tribuere si enim Christus meritus est fidem, tum fides conditio esse non potest,* c. 8. p. 95.

§. 10. Fourteenthly, If God did will that our sins should be accounted unto Christ without any condition on our part, then it was his Will that they should be discounted unto us without any condition, and the Reason thereof is, because the charging and accounting of them unto him, necessarily includes our discharge; the imputing of our sins to Christ, was formally, the non-imputing of them unto us: Gods accounting of them unto him (as hath been shown) was a reall discounting of them from us, for they could not be accounted or charged upon both, without a manifest contradiction in the thing it selfe, and in the Justice of God. But God willed that our sins should be accounted to, and charged upon Christ, without any condition performed by us, for he actually suffered for them, before we were. *Ergo.*

§. 11. To these Arguments from Scripture, I might adde many plaine Texts, which doe declare that our reconciliation, is the actual and immediate effect of Christs death, as *Col.* 1. 14. *Eph.* 1. 7. *We have redemption* [not, we shall have] *the forgivenesse* [or non-imputation] *of sins according to the riches of his*

grace [not according to any condition performed by us] *having obtained eternall redemption for us*, *Heb.*9.12. And 2 *Cor.* 5.18,19. (a place which we have often mentioned) the Apostle shewes that Christ by his death, made such a reconciliation for us, as that God thereupon *did not impute our sins unto us*, which was long before any condition could be performed by us. Elsewhere, *That Christ by himselfe purged and expiated our sins*, *Heb.*1.3. and *afterwards sate downe, as having finished that worke*, chap.10.12. Now sin that is fully purged, and expiated, is not imputable to the sinner. The same Apostle addes, that Christ by his sacrifice *hath for ever perfected all them for whom it was offered*, *Heb.* 10.14. And in another place, *that he hath made them compleat*, as to the forgivenesse of their sins, *Col.* 2. 10,13,14. In *Rom.*8.33,34. He argues from the death of Christ to the non-imputation of our sins, *Who can lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect, it is God that justifieth, it is Christ that dyed*; whereas notwithstanding sin would have been chargeable upon them, and they, condemnable if the death of Christ had not procured their discharge, without the intervention of any condition performed by them.

CHAP. XV.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *Replyes to the second Objection* (as he cals it) *concerning our being Justified in Christ as a common person, are examined.*

THe Argument was proposed by me at the time of our Conference, in this manner. *They that were in Christ as a common person, before they beleeved, were justified before they beleeved; But many were in Christ, as a common person, before they beleeved, Ergo:* Mr. *W.* denyed both Propositions. The *major* I proved in this wise: *If Christ was justified before many that are in him doe beleeve; then they that are in him, were justified before they beleeved.* But Christ was justified before ma-

ny

ny that are in Christ do beleeve, Ergo. His answer hereunto (as I remember) was, *I deny all*: And therefore the Assumption was confirmed from *Isa.* 50. 8. 9. in this manner, *Christ was justified at his resurrection, but that happened before many of them who are in Christ as a common person do beleeve. Ergo*, That Christ was justified at his resurrection, is clear from this Text, *He is near that justifieth me, &c.* Which words (I said) were uttered by the Prophet in the person of our Saviour, in the time of his greatest humiliation, who comforted himselfe with this, *that the Lord would shortly justifie him*; which was to be done at his Resurrection[a], when the Lord publickly declared to all the world, that he was acquitted and discharged from all those sins which were laid upon him, and which he, as a Surety undertook to satisfie. The sequel of the *major* was also proved by this Enthymem. *The acts of a common person doe belong unto them, whom he represents; whatsoever is done by, or to a common person, as such, is to be attributed to them in whose stead he stands; and therefore if Christ were justified, all that were in him were justified also*: For seeing that he was not justified, from his own, but from the sins of others; all they whom he represents were justified in his Justification: Whereunto hee replyed, *That Christ was not justified according to the tenor of the New Covenant*, which did lead us to that discourse of the New Covenant which is afterwards mentioned, of which in its place.

[a] See M. *Goodw.* Christ set forth sect. 3. c. 5.

§. 2. We shall now take a view of his Replyes to this Argument, which we find in his printed copy. And 1. he distinguisheth of a threefold Justification, (1) Purposed, (2) Purchased, and (3) Exemplified; all which are before Faith; So then by his own confession, *Justification in a Scripture sense, goes before Faith*; Which is that horrid opinion, he hath all this while so eagerly opposed. It may be he will say as [b] *Arminius* doth, *that neither of these were actuall Justification*, which were a poor put off; for as Dr. *Twisse*[c] observes, *Omnis Justificatio simpliciter dicta, congruenter exponenda est, de Justificatione actuali; Analogum per se positum stat pro famosiori significato*: When we speak of Justification simply, there is no man but understands it of actuall Justification. And first, That which he calls Justification purposed in the Decree of God, is reall and actuall Justification;

[b] *Actualis peccatorum remissio & justificatio absque fide, &c. nemini contingunt.*

[c] Vind. Grat. l. 1. p. 2 sect. 254.

for if Justification be Gods will not to punish, or to deal with his Elect according to their sins (as both the Psalmist and Apostle do define it) then when Gods Will was in actual being, their Justification was actual: It is absurd, to say, That God did decree or purpose to will any thing whatsoever, his Will being his Essence, which admits no cause, either within or without God. (2) We have shewn before, that, Justification being taken for the effect of Gods Will, to wit, our discharge from the Obligation of the Law, it was actually, because solely, and absolutely obtained by the death of Christ; there being no other cause out of God, which concurs to the producing of this effect.

§. 3. The third Branch of his distinction, *Justification exemplified*, is, *terminus redundans*, a member that may well be spared; for (1) there is not the least hint thereof in Holy Writ; the Scripture no where calls our Saviour, the example or pattern of our Justification. For though he is proposed to us as an example in acts of Moral Obedience [d], yet in his works of Mediation, he was not so; in these he was not an exemplary, but a meritorious procuring cause; an example is proposed to be imitated, and therefore we are frequently exhorted to imitate our Saviour in works of Sanctification [e], but we are no where bid to imitate him in our Justification, or in justifying our selves. It was needless he should be a pattern of our Justification; for this pattern must be of use, either unto us, or unto God: Not to us, because we do not justifie our selves; not unto God, because he needs no pattern or example to guide or direct him. (2) He that payes our debts to the utmost farthing, and thereupon receives a discharge, is more then a pattern of our release: Our real discharge is in his, as our real debt was upon him. And therefore his Grand-father *Parker* [f] said well, *That Christs Resurrection was the* Actual Justification, *both of him and us.* (3) If Christ were onely a pattern and example of our Justification, then was he justified from his own sins, and consequently was a sinner, which is the most horrid blasphemy that can be uttered. The reason of the consequence is evident; for if Christ were but a pattern of our Justification, then was he justified, as we are: Now we are justified from our own sins, which we our selves have committed, and therefore his Justification must be from his own sins, or else the example and counter-

[d] See *Reynolds* 3. Treat. p. 410.

[e] Matth. 11. 29. Joh. 13. 15. Phil. 2. 5. 1 Pet. 2. 21. 1 John 2. 6.

[f] Vid. Sup. c 3.

part

part do not agree. (4) This expreſſion intimates, that as Chriſt was juſtified by performing the conditions required of him, ſo we are juſtified by performing the conditions required of us; which in effect makes men their own Saviours, as before. (5) He recedes very far, both from the meaning and expreſſions of all our Orthodox Writers, who do conſtantly call our Saviour a common perſon, but never that I finde, the exemplary cauſe of our Juſtification. I ſhall onely refer the Reader to what his Grand-father *Parker* [g] hath written of this matter, who hath copiouſly and learnedly proved both from Scripture, and the Fathers, That Chriſt no leſs then the firſt *Adam*, was made a common perſon by the Ordination of God, and his own voluntary undertaking; who took our ſins upon him, as if they had been his own, and for the ſame made full ſatisfaction to Divine Juſtice, and conſequently received as full a diſcharge in our behalf. (6) This expreſſion of his, favors rankly, both of Pelagianiſm and Socinianiſm. The Pelagians as they made the firſt *Adam* a meer pattern and example, in communicating ſin to his poſterity; ſo they made the ſecond *Adam* but the pattern and example of our reconciliation. Thoſe words, 2 *Cor.* 5. 18. *Who hath reconciled us to himſelf* [by Jeſus Chriſt] they expounded, *by his Doctrine, and by his Example* [h], *i. e.* By our obedience to his Doctrine, and by imitating his example. The Socinians do ſpeak the ſame Language [i], *Chriſtus ideo ſervator noſter dicitur, quod ſalutis viam nobis annunciavit; quod ſalutis viam nobis confirmavit, miraculorum patratione, ſanguinis effuſione, reſurrectione à mortuis, quod vitæ exemplo viam ſalutis nobis oſtendit.* Chriſt is therefore called a Saviour, becauſe by his Life and Doctrine he hath ſhewed us the way of Salvation, and by his Miracles and Sufferings hath confirmed the ſame [k]. I am ſorry to hear the Language of *Aſhdod*, from the mouth of a Proteſtant Miniſter.

[g] *Park.* de deſcenſ. l. 3. ſect. 49, 50, 53.

[h] Vid. *Eſtium* in loc.

[i] Socin. parte 1. de Servat. c. 2, 3, 4.

[k] *Steg. Photin.* Diſp. 24. q. 3.

§. 4. The excuſe which he gives, for calling our Saviour, the exemplary cauſe of our Juſtification, rather then a common perſon, is both fallacious and impertinent. [*I uſe* (ſaith he) *the term of an exemplary cauſe, rather then of a common perſon, becauſe a common perſon may be the effect of thoſe whom he repreſents, as the Parliament of the Commonwealth.*]

1. It is fallacious dealing, under pretence of giving a more ſig-

nificant term to leave out that, wherein the force of the Argument lay: He seems to intimate, that the phrases are of equal latitude, that an exemplary cause, doth express as much as a common person, which is clearly false; for the act of the Exemplar, is not the act of the Imitator; as the act of a common person, is the act of them whom he represents, which in *Law*, is accounted as if it had been done by them. Parents and Superiors are examples to their Children and Inferiors, they are not common persons, as *Adam* was to all his posterity, *In whose loyns* (saith the Apostle) *we all sinned*; and in this respect, *he is made a figure of Christ*, *Rom.* 5. 14. Whose Righteousness is accounted unto them, for whom he died; as *Adams* sin was accounted unto us, when as yet we were not. Vers. 15, 17, 18.

2. It is impertinent, for though Christ be not the effect of them, whom he represents; yet that hinders not, but that his discharge was theirs, no less then if he had been chosen by them. I can see no reason why the act of God, constituting and appointing his Son to be the Head, Surety, and Common Person, to all his Elect, should not be as effectual for the communication of his benefits to them, as their own choice and election: We did not chuse *Adam* to be our common person, and yet his sin was imputed to us; so though we did not chuse the Lord Jesus to stand in our stead, that is no reason why his Righteousness and Satisfaction should not be accounted ours.

§. 5. The instances he hath brought from our *Personal Resurrection*, and *Inherent Sanctification*, to render this Argument absurd, have not the least force to conclude against the efficacy of Christs Satisfaction, for our immediate discharge from sin and wrath. It doth not follow, that because we did not personally rise with Christ, and were not inherently sanctified in his Sanctification. *Ergo*. We had not in his Resurrection an actual discharge from the guilt of sin; there is not the like reason for these. For to our actual discharge, there needed no more then the payment of our debt, or satisfaction to the Law of God, but our personal resurrection necessarily supposeth both our life and death. Again, our Inherent Sanctification cannot be without our personal existence, and the use of those means which God hath appointed for that end; but our Justification is wrought without us, and for us,

Though

Though Christ hath fully merited our Sanctification and Resurrection to glory (in which respect we are said *to be crucified with him*, and *to be risen with Christ*) as well as our Justification, yet it is not necessary that these benefits should be communicated to us at the same time, and in the same manner. It is no such absurdity to say, Christ hath purchased our Resurrection, though we are not risen, as to say, Christ hath purchased our discharge, and yet we are not discharged; for (as hath been shewn[1]) to say a debt is discharged, and yet that it is justly chargable, implies a contradiction. Let the Reader judge, whether the Assertion that follows, be not much more confident, then solid. [*No man living can shew any reason of difference* (as if he were master of as much Reason, as all men living) *why we may not as justly infer, that our Resurrection is passed already, because we are risen in Christ; as that our Justification is passed before we believe, because we are justified in Christ.* Enough hath been said to evict the disproportion of these consequences.

[1] Cap. 14. sect. 2.

§. 6. 2. His next distinction, is, *That Justification is either Causal and Virtual, or Actual and Formal; We were* (saith he) *causally and virtually justified in Christs Justification, but not actually and formally.*] Our Protestant Divines do generally place the *formale* of Justification, in the non-imputation of sin: Now if our sins were formally imputed unto Christ, even to a full Satisfaction, they could not formally be imputed unto us also, unless a debt discharged by a Surety, can be justly reckoned unto him that did first contract it. It is true, a debt may be imputed both to Principal and Surety, before it be discharged, but after to neither: It is granted by all Orthodox Writers, That our Saviour by giving himself to death, made full satisfaction to the utmost farthing, for all the sins or debts of Gods Elect. Now, I say, the discharge of a debt, is formally the discharge of the debtor, unless we speak of an outward formality, such as is by an Acquittance, which serves, but either against the unfaithfulness of the creditor, who otherwise would deny the payment, or else against the ignorance of the debtor; who being not at the payment, might still look upon himself as a debtor, and lyable to all the consequences of his debts. In this sence, our Formal Justification is by the gracious sentence of the Gospel, terminated upon our Consciences; but otherwise, intrinsecally;

trinſecally and formally, the payment of our debt is our real diſcharge. I ſhall grant him, That the death of Chriſt doth juſtifie us onely virtually; but yet I affirm, That the ſatisfaction in his death (being performed, and accepted for us) doth juſtifie us formally; for the actual payment of a debt, is that which formally makes him that was the debtor, no debtor. And therefore, *Chriſt dying for us*, or *for our ſins*; his *reconciling us to God*, and *our being juſtified*, are Synonima's in Scripture phraſe, *Rom.* 5. 8, 9, 10.

Object. *Object.* But againſt this, ſome have alledged that of the Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. where he ſaith, *That Chriſt was made ſin for us ἵνα γενώμεθα, that we might be made* (he doth not ſay, that thereby we are made) *the Righteouſneſs of God in him.* Whence they would infer, That the laying of our ſins on Chriſt, is onely an Antecedent, which tends to the procuring of our Juſtification, and not the ſame formally. Whereunto we Anſwer, (1) That this phraſe [*that we might be*, or *be made*] doth not alwayes ſignifie the final, but ſometimes the formal cauſe: As when it is ſaid, That light is let in, that darkneſs might be expelled; where the immiſſion of light, is formally the expulſion of darkneſs. (2) Though the imputation of our ſins to Chriſt, and of his Righteouſneſs to us, do differ; yet the imputation of ſin to him, and non-imputation of it unto us, is but one and the ſame act of God; which was, when *God was in Chriſt reconciling the world unto himſelf, not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them*, before the word of Reconciliation was given; and therefore before they believed, *Verſ.* 19. (3) Though the imputation of our ſin to Chriſt, and ſo the non-imputation thereof to us, have an antecedency in reſpect of imputation of Righteouſneſs to us, yet it is of nature onely, and not of time. For though it be objected, That we were not then, and therefore Righteouſneſs could not be imputed unto us, yet it follows not: They might as well object, Our ſins were not then. *Ergo*, They could not be imputed unto Chriſt; whereas in this buſineſs of Juſtification, God calleth things that are not, as though they were. But if Mr. *W.* had ſhewn what it is that formally juſtifies us, beſides the ſatisfaction made in Chriſts death, ſomewhat more might have been ſpoken to it.

Anſw.

Rom. 4. 17.

§. 7. The cloſe of this Paragraph is ſuch a dirty puddle, that I intended

intended to have stept over it in silence; seeing it is so hard to touch pitch, or pollution, and not be defiled therewith; but yet for their sakes that do not know me, I shall stay the Reader a little, whilest I wash off that dirt, which he hath thrown upon me, and others. [*They are credulous souls, I will assure you, that will be drawn by such devices as these, into Schisme and Faction, to the hardning, and discomforting of many hearts in our land, when the Opinion it self (should it obtain) will do good to, while the world stands.*] I dare not allow my self *Armadus*, or to pay him in his own coyn, having perswaded my heart to follow better examples, even his, *who when he was revild, revild not again*, 1 Pet. 2. 23. And theirs, *who being reproached, returned blessing*, 1 Cor. 4. 12. In these few words, there are a heap of slanders packt together, both against my self and others, and (which is more grievous to be born) against the truths and ways of God, which we adhere to. 1. They that do embrace this Doctrine which I have taught, are affected with credulity and levity. I do verily believe there is not one of my charge, but is able to say as the *Samaritans*, John 4. 42. *We believe not because of thy saying, for we have heard him our selves, &c.* I dare say, they are better setled, then to be shaken with the sophistry of this Assailant. I am sure, both they, and many more, will bear me witness, how frequently I do admonish them, of taking up matters of Faith, upon trust and credit; it being Idolatry in a high degree, to give the most Spiritual Worship of God, *viz.* Our Faith, to a weak and sinful man. He that believes a truth upon a Humane account, is no better Christian, then he that doth believe a lie. Let the prudent judge, whether they are not more justly obnoxious to this censure of abusing the credulity of simple souls, who will not endure that their hearers should bring their Doctrines to the touchstone. The tyranny and usurpation of the Popish Priests, is far more excusable, then the affected domination of some of ours; for they believe, that their Church is infallible, and cannot erre; ours confess, that they are fallible, and may erre, and yet expect subscription to their Dictates, no less then to the Canon it self: It is held a *piaculum* to question, or debate, what ever they say. 2. It is but an unhandsome character, he hath given my Arguments, which he calls *decoyes*. The Apostle, I take it, hath Englished his French,

Eph. 4. 14. *The ſleight of men, who lie in wait to deceive.* I dare ſay he knows me better, then in cold blood to accuſe me of driving on ſuch a devillish trade, as wittingly to deceive mens precious ſouls: And therefore, I ſhall call in no other Compurgator then his own Conſcience.

§. 8. As for his charge of Schiſme and Faction, I am not carefull to anſwer it, being the uſuall foam of paſſionate men, who when they want Arguments to convince fall to downright railing[m]; *Schiſme* (ſayes a learned man[n]) *in the common manage of the word is a meer Theologicall Scar-crow, wherewith they who uphold a party in Religion, ſeek to fright away others from enquiring into, and cloſing with that which they doe oppoſe:* Both this and the other are moſt frequently in their mouthes, who are deepeſt in the guilt that is imported by them. *Ahab* by his ſins brought down Plagues and Judgements upon *Iſrael*; yet he cals *Elijah, the troubler of Iſrael*, 1 *King.* 18. 17. *Athalia* was the cheifeſt Traytor, and yet ſhe was the firſt that cryed out *Treaſon*, 2 *King.* 11. 14. *Tertullus* was the Orator of the tumult, yet he inveighs againſt *Paul* as *a Ringleader of Sedition*, *Act.* 24. 5, 6. the Church of *Rome*, which hath fallen from the purity of the Catholique Faith, brands them for Schiſmaticks who refuſe to continue in the ſame Apoſtaſie. Amongſt our ſelves the late Innovators aſperſed all thoſe with Faction and Schiſme who would not proſtitute their Conſciences to the Wils of men; and to this day ignorant and prophane perſons think all them to be Factious and Schiſmaticks who live more ſtrictly, and religiouſly then themſelves. I muſt needs ſay, they are leſſe to be blamed, ſeeing Profeſſors and Miniſters do give them ſuch an evill example.

§. 9. I confeſſe though in common uſe, Schiſme and Faction are but ridiculous termes, yet the things themſelves are reall evils; the one being an offence againſt Civill, and the other againſt Eccleſiaſticall peace. If this Author had ſhewn wherein I had offended againſt either of them, I doubt not but I ſhould have cleared my ſelfe at a juſt Tribunal. For 1. I have ever been ſo far from factious Combinations, or attempting any thing againſt the Civil Peace, that (as I verily beleeve) it hath not been the leaſt cauſe of my troubles, that I have alwayes prayed for, and preſſed ſubjection ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις[o], *to the powers in being*; had others of my calling

[m] *Rationibus vicli, dentibus vincunt*, Bal. ep. 80. *Hæretici argumentis victi calumniis meditantur.* Athan. *Iſtæ ſunt hæreticorum machinæ, aut convicti de perfidia, ad maledicta ſe conferant.* Hier. Apo. cont. Ruffin.

[n] *Hales* tr. of Schiſm.

[o] Rom. 13. 1.

calling done the like, the disaffections of the people against the present Government had not been so great as yet they are in these parts. 2. As for Schisme, I know no ground that he hath to charge me with it; for Schisme cannot be, but where communion is, or ought to be held: now to my best remembrance, I never refused to hold Christian comunimon with any person or persons, with whom by the Rules of Christ I conceived I ought. It is true, we receive not all within that Parochial circuit wherein we live, unto communion in Church Priviledges; because either they refuse to make Profession of their Faith, and to declare their subjection to the Ordinances of Jesus Christ: and so they separate from us, and not we from them; or else they are such as in their practises do contradict the profession which they seem to make, like them *Tit.* 1.16. And as for Members of other Churches, we are ready to give them the right hand of fellowship, unlesse the person, or the Church to which he belongs, lyes under the guilt of any publick scandal P. If he doth accuse me of Schism, because I have refrained going to some Lectures that are preached in this City: I doubt not but the wise will be satisfied with a just Apology. I doe not conceive that Christians are bound to frequent every Lecture that is preached near them; the obligation to this Duty must needs be determined by Christian prudence; and we ought to follow that which we conceive hath the greatest tendency to Edification. Now I confesse I have rather chosen to deprive my selfe of that benefit, which sometime I might injoy, then to wound my Conscience by keeping of silence when I hear the Truths and Servants of God declaimed against. Dr. *Jackson* q (a man large enough in the point of communion) grants, *that there is just cause to separate from the communion of a visible Church* (our practise doth not amount so high) *when we are urged or constrained to professe or beleive some points of Doctrine, or to adventure upon some Practises, which are contrary to the Rule of Faith, or Love of God; and in case we are utterly deprived of freedome of Conscience, in professing what we inwardly beleeve,* for which he cites 1 *Cor.* 7.23. *Ye are bought with a price, be yee not Servants of men; For* (sayes he) *although we were perswaded that we might communicate with such a Church without evident danger of damnation; yet in as much as we cannot communicate with it upon any*

P See Mr. *Cottons* way of the Churches, p. 78 &c.

q Treat. of the Church, cap. 14

better termes, then Servants and Bondslaves doe with their Masters, we are bound in Conscience, and religious discretion, when lawfull occasions or opportunities are offered, to use our Liberty, and seek to our Freedom, rather then to live in bondage. Let them allow us that liberty (which we offer to them) to discusse and examine the Doctrines which they do deliver, and if they shall be found erroneous, to professe against them, I shall not often decline such opportunities.

§. 10. But says Mr. *W.* the contending about this matter [*will harden and discomfort more soules in an houre, then the opinion it selfe will doe good to, while the world stands*] 1. It seems he is of *Curcellæus* his mind, that the matter in question is of so small concernment, that it ought not to breed a controversie: I marvel then, he should offer himselfe a Champion on either part, especially in a place where he had so little to doe, and where his humility might suppose there were others as able as himselfe to defend the notion which he stickles for. No man will imagine that he ingaged in this controversie upon conscientious principles, if he judgeth the Point in question to be of little moment. For my part I cannot looke upon that as such a trifle, which doth so nearly concern the glory of Gods Grace, the vertue and efficacy of Christs Blood, upon which alone poor Souls can with confidence and security build their hopes of Eternall life. 2. I have shewed before, that the Doctrine it selfe is guiltlesse both of hardning, and discomforting the soules of men, and if these effects doe insue the pressing of it in a Christian way, they are accidental, and consequently ought not to be charged upon the Tenent. I know none that are discomforted by these Debates but such as the Apostle speaks of [2] *Who are ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the Truth.* For having pinned their Faith on the sleeves of others, they are jealous of their credit, least they should be thought to have builded on a sandy foundation.

[2] 2 Tim. 3. 7.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Of Mr. Woodbridges Answer to the third Objection, which he hath framed concerning our being in Covenant with God before believing.

THis last he scoffingly calls *the great Argument*, which as he hath proposed it, was none of mine. We fell upon our discourse of the Covenant [a], upon his saying that *Christ was not justified according to the tenor of the New Covenant*; whereunto I replyed; *If the New Covenant were made with Christ, then Christ was justified according to the tenor of the New Covenant; But the New Covenant was made with Christ, Ergo.* He denyed the Assumption. But by the way let me give the Reader the Reason of the Sequel, which is as followeth: *The New* Covenant contains all the Promises which God hath made to the Head and the Members, both to Christ Personal, and to Christ Mystical; the same Covenant is conditional to him, and absolute to us; a Covenant of Works to him, but a Covenant of Grace to us. Now if it be one and the same Covenant, by which Christ and we are Justified, (though in a far different manner) he by Works, and we by Grace, he by his own Righteousness, and we by his; then his Justification was by vertue of the New Covenant, that we are justified by. We read but of one Covenant that was made with Christ, by, and according unto which he was justified, when he had paid the debt which he had undertaken.

[a] See before, cap. 15.

To confirme the Assumption, *That the New Covenant was made with Christ*, I alleadged (4.) the Judgement of the late Assembly, who in their larger Catechisme [b] have laid down this Proposition, *in terminis*, *The Covenant of Grace was made with Christ as the second Adam, and in him, with all the Elect as his seed.* First he denied the Allegation, (though I believe at another time he would have taken my word for a greater matter) I desired Mr. C. an Assembly man, (who sat next unto him) to

[b] pag. 77.

clare, whether it were not ſo; but he refuſed to ſpeak, though I urged him twice: Had he remembred the words of our Saviour, *John* 8.37. I dare ſay, he would not have refuſed to perform ſo juſt an office: At length a Gentleman * that ſtood by (one of the Pariſh Elders) ingenuouſly acknowledged, That I had truly alledged it. Then Mr. *W.* denied their authority, ſaying, *It was a Humane teſtimony.* I accepted his Anſwer, and deſired the people to remember what Mr. *W.* had told them (knowing that many preſent would receive it ſooner from him, then they would from me) That the Authority of the Aſſembly, is but Humane, and not Divine, and Infallible; and conſequently, That their Votes, and Determinations, are of no greater force, then the Proofs and Reaſons which do confirm them. And therefore, I immediately offered him Divine Authority, in the Argument following: *If they with whom God did make the New Covenant, when it was firſt revealed and exhibited, were in that federal Act or Relation, the types and figures of Jeſus Chriſt, then the New Covenant was made onely with Chriſt.* For that which is attributed to a perſon, as a type, or figure, belongs properly and peculiarly to the Antitype. *But all they with whom the New Covenant was made, when it was firſt exhibited, were in that federal Relation the types of Chriſt,* Ergo. The *Minor* was proved thus, *The New Covenant was made with* Abraham; *but* Abraham *in his federal Relation, or in receiving that Covenant, was a type of Chriſt,* Ergo. Whereunto (if it had been needful) I had added divers other Inſtances; as of *Noah, Phinehas, David, &c.* who in the reſpective Covenants, which God made with them, were alſo types and figures of Jeſus Chriſt. The Covenant made with *Noah, Gen.*9.9. was, (as our Divines [c] have obſerved) the Covenant of Grace; and that Scripture it ſelf doth make it manifeſt, *Iſai.* 54. 8, 9. Now *Noah* in receiving the Covenant, was a type of Chriſt; for it followed immediately upon the offering up of his Sacrifice, *Chap.*8. *v.* 20, 21. which clearly ſignified, That all the effects of Gods Covenant are procured for us, by that *Sacrifice of a ſweet ſmelling ſavor, which Chriſt hath offered, Eph.*5.2. So *Phinehas* his Covenant concerning the everlaſting Prieſthood, *Num.*25.12, 13. was the very ſame which was confirmed by oath unto Chriſt, *Pſal.*110.4. it was made with *Phinehas* as a Typical Mediator, becauſe

* Mr. R. H.

[c] Iun. orat. 2. de fœd. novo. Rivet. in loc. *Quamvis fœdus illud videatur tantùm ſpectare præſentem vitam, tamen altiùs conſcendendum eſt ad rem ſignificatam; eſt enim fœdus gratiæ, &c.*

because he stood in the gap, to turn away Gods wrath, *Verse* 31. In like manner the Covenant made with *David*, was the Covenant of Grace, 2 *Sam.* 23. 6. And therefore it is called *The sure mercies of David*, *Isai.* 55. 3. Now that *David* in receiving that Covenant, was a type of Christ, is evident from *Acts* 13. 34. *Psalm* 89. *verse* 3, 4, 19, 20, 24, 28, 34, *&c.* But I must return to Mr. *W.* who denied the *Minor*, viz. *That the Covenant made with* Abraham, *was the New Covenant*; which I proved in this wise. *If the whole New Covenant be comprised in this one promise*, I will be thy God, and the God of thy Seed; *then the New Covenant was made with* Abraham: *But the whole New Covenant is comprised in this promise*, I will be thy God, *&c. Ergo.* He answered, I deny all: I replied to him, That the Sequel is evident, forasmuch as this promise is the sum of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. And the Assumption is acknowledged by all Divines that ever I met with; nay the Apostle himself calls it the Gospel, *Gal.* 3. 8. If my memory fail not, he affirmed, That the Covenant made with *Abraham*, was onely concerning temporal blessings, as the Land of *Canaan*, *&c.* whereof Circumcision was a Seal. I well remember, That upon his often affirming, that the New Covenant made with us, is this Conditional promise, *If thou believest, thou shalt be saved*; I offered him this Argument, to evict the contrary; *If we are in Covenant, or do partake of some benefits of the Covenant before we do believe, then that conditional promise is not the New Covenant; but we do partake of the same benefits of Covenant before wee doe believe. Ergo.* The reason of the Sequel is, because the condition must be performed, before the benefit, which is promised upon condition, can be received. The *Minor* was proved by a *medium*, which Mr. *Rutherford*[c] makes use of, for the same purpose. *The Spirit which works Faith, is given us before we do believe; but the Spirit which works Faith, is a blessing of the New Covenant, and given us by vertue of the Covenant.* Ergo, *We do partake of some blessings or benefits of the New Covenant before we believe.* He denied, That the Spirit which works Faith, is given us by vertue of the New Covenant, which I proved

[d] *Haec promissio, Ero Deus tuus, &c. brevissima quidem verbis, sed sensu ampissimo, ad hanc enim referuntur omnes quae in Scripturis sparsae sunt promissiones, praesertim quae sunt de salute aeterna, &c.* Zanch. de Nat. Dei. l. 4. c. 5. q. 2. sect. 5.

[c] *Hoc foedere, justificationis gratia continetur,* Pisc. Anal. in Gal. 3 6. Cum multis aliis.

[e] *Nihil falsius est dogmate isto Arminiano, neminem diligi in Spiritus Sanctus, Christo, nisi ratis rationem in eo per fidem, nam per & propter Christum datur ejus gratiam credimus.* Joh. 9. 36. & 14. 16. Exercit. p. 38.

from

from the Tenor of the New Covenant mentioned, *Heb.*8. 10. *I will put my Laws in their minde, &c. and they shall all know me.* He denied, That this was a promise of the Spirit which works Faith, but rather of the Spirit of Adoption, which follows Faith: That it is a promise of the Spirit which works Faith, was proved from *John* 6. 45. where our Saviour, having shewn that none do believe, but by a Divine and Supernatural power, *No man can come to me, except the Father draw him*, he addes, *It is written in the Prophets, they shall be all taught of God, i. e.* God will give his Spirit unto all that are ordained to life, which shall enable them to believe: The places in the Prophets, where this is written, or promised, are *Isa.*54. 13. and *Jere.*31. 34. which is cited by the Apostle, *Heb.*8. Then he denied, That this was the New Covenant made with us; whereunto I replied, *The New Covenant which is made with Spiritual* Israel, *is the Covenant made with us; but the Covenant is made with Spiritual* Israel, *Ergo.* His Answer was, I deny all; Though the *Major* be as clear as the Sun, That all the Elect, whether Jews or Gentiles, are Spiritual *Israel*, or the Seed of *Abraham*. See the Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Chapters to the *Romans*, and *Gal.*3. 26, 29. And the Assumption is in the Text, *This is the Covenant that I will make with the house of* Israel *in those days, &c.* And therefore I rejoyned, *Contra negantem principia, non est disputandum*; and so our Conference brake off. I have here given the Reader a true Narrative of our Discourse concerning this matter, wherein I take the Lord to witness, I have not wittingly concealed, or added a syllable, to vary either from his sence, or my own.

§. 2. I shall now return to his Printed Discourse, and take things in the same order as they lie before us. The Argument, as he hath formed it, runs thus: *If we are in Covenant before we believe, then we are justified before we believe; but we are in Covenant before we believe*, Ergo. Wherein (1) he blames the Proposition; *For* (sayes he) *though it were supposed that we are in Covenant before Faith, yet it will not follow, That we are justified:* His Reason is, *Because the blessings of the Covenant have an order and dependance one upon another, and are enjoyed successively one after another.* But by his favor the Sequel is not invalidated by this Reason; for though a man be not sanctified, and

and glorified before Faith; yet if he be in Covenant with God, *i. e.* One of the Elect, to whom the Grace of the New Covenant appertains, he is certainly justified: For (1) God from all eternity, did will, not to punish his Elect ones; which (as hath been shewn) is real Justification, it being forgiveness in the heart of God: Or (2) taking it for an effect of his Will, Justification is the first benefit that doth accrew to us by the death of Christ. God hath promised from thence forth *to remember the sins of his people no more*, Isa. 43. 25. & 54. 9. and in Ezek. 36. 25. He first promiseth *to cleanse us from all our filthiness*, (which must be meant of our Justification; for by Sanctification, our inherent filthiness is not perfectly cleansed in this life,) and then *to give us a new heart*. And *Chap.* 16. he first sayes unto the Soul, *Live*, (which is the sentence of Justification) and then he adorns it with the precious gifts of his holy Spirit. It is sufficiently known, That the generality of our Protestant Divines, in comparing the blessings of the Covenant, have given the precedency to Justification; some have ascribed to it, a priority of time, but all of Nature, before the rest, *Perperam & absurde prorsus inter effecta Sanctificationis numeratur Justificatio, quæ illam naturâ præcedit, &c.* Justification (sayes Tilenus[f]) *is most absurdly made an effect or consequent of Sanctification, which in nature doth go before it: A man cannot be sanctified, until he is first justified; for the tree must be good, before it can bring forth good fruit.* Bishop *Downham*[g] accounts it a gross error, to say, That Sanctification goes before Justification; *For* (sayes he) *Sanctification is the end and fruit, &c.* So that if they have right to any benefit of the Covenant before Faith, it must be to Justification; for Faith is a part of Sanctification, and the same thing cannot be before it self.

[f] Syntag. p. 2. c. 45. Thes. 38.

[g] New Cov. p. 289.

§. 3. (2) He denies the Assumption, *viz. That we are in Covenant with God, or, that we have any right and title to any blessing of the Covenant, before we believe*: But before he will give his Reasons for the Negative, he is willing to hear mine for the Affirmative. This seeming civility, ushers in a notorious slander, That [*I was so obstreperous in our Conference, that I would not give him a fair hearing,*] which hath been sufficiently disproved in another place[h]; nay, his own mouth did acquit me, in

[h] See the Epistle to the Reader before my Sermon, on Psal. 45. 6.

the close of that discourse, before (I believe) a thousand witnesses. I wonder, though his Conscience was asleep when this fell from his Pen, that his memory should fail him! Me thinks he should have been more tender of his own reputation, then to contradict himself, though he had a desire to blast mine; but, as if it were not enough to mis-report my actions, he takes upon him the office of God, to judge my heart. *I believe* (says he) *he is resolved to give it unto no body else, whiles the judgement of the cause must be left to the people.* Yes to himself, or any one else, when I have an occasion for the like civility. I am sure he hath not found me heretofore, of so morose a spirit, as not to weigh and yeeld unto better reason: he is do fit champion to defend the Faith, who is so much a stranger to the rules of Charity, *which thinketh no evil, but hopes the best*[x]. I confess, I am yet to seek for the Reason of his next clause [*whilest the judgement of the cause must be left to the people.*] One would think, that he who leaves the judgement of his cause unto the people, should be most willing, they should have a fair hearing of whatsoever can be said, either *pro* or *con*, or else he cannot expect their Votes should be for him. The people are apt to think he hath the better cause, whose mouth is stopt. But perhaps it sticks in his stomack, That in our Conference, I desired the people to weigh and judge of some interpretations of Scripture, which were given by him. It was far from my thoughts to refer the decision of the Question unto most voices, either of Ministers, or people. The Judgement desired, was that of *private discretion*, and not of *publick determination*: though the latter ought not to be usurped by Ministers, whose Reasons, and not their Votes, must satisfie mens Consciences; yet the former ought not to be denied to the meanest Christians, who are required to *judge for themselves*[y], *to prove*[z], *and try*[a], the Doctrines which are brought unto them. Now why this expression should be faulted, I see no cause, unless men would have the people to content themselves with an implicite Faith, such as the *Romanists* do allow their disciples, who use them as Babes, which must swallow whatsoever their Nurses do put into their mouths[b]. *The Church of Christ* (saith *Optatus*) *is* rationabilis, *she hath the use both of Natural and Supernatural Reason.* Did Christians more generally see with their own eyes, make use of that Light and Reason which

[x] 1 Cor. 13. 5, 7.

[y] Iob 5. 27.
[z] 1 Thes 5. 21.
[a] 1 Ioh. 4. 1. Acts 17. 11.

[b] Vid. Daven. de judice, &c. p. 464.

[1] *Oportet—— esse memorem.*

which God hath given them, they would never acquiesce in many of those Dictates, which are imposed upon them: will any man that hath a spark of Reason believe that [*I am*] doth signifie [*I will bee.*]

§. 4. Well, now he hath heard my Reason. *That we are in Covenant, or have a right and title to the blessings of the Covenant before we believe, because some benefits of the Covenant, to wit, the Spirit which worketh Faith is given us before we believe.* What hath he to say against it? 1. He undertakes to explaine (that which is plain enough) the word [*Given*] as that it is taken (1.) *for a meer intending, or appointing*, and (2) *for the actual collating of a benefit, so as that it is received, and possessed by him to whom it is given.* 2. He tells us of sundry ways, how the Spirit is said to be given (1.) *Essentially*, (2.) *Personally*, (3.) *Operatively*, all which, is nothing at all to the matter in hand; but serves meerly to raise a dust to blind the unwary Reader. The termes need no other distinction nor explication, being cleare enough to be understood by the weakest capacity. When we say, *That the Spirit which works Faith, is given us before wee believe*; one can well imagine that we mean it of Gods purpose, or decree to give the Spirit, but of the actuall sending, or bestowing of him; nor yet of an Essentiall, or Personal giving of the Spirit, so as to be hypostatically united to us as the God-head of the Son is to the Humane nature; though some godly men[o], have affirmed, that the person of the Spirit dwels in the Saints, from those Texts, *John* 14. 16, 17, 26. 15. 26. 2 *Tim.* 1. 14. *Rom.* 8. 11. 1 *Cor.* 6. 19. 3. 16. Yet none (that are sober) ever affirmed, that the person of the Spirit, dwelleth in us in such a manner, as to make us one person with himselfe, or to communicate his personal Properties to us; so that I may say of this Argument, as *Maldonate* of a certain Text in the Gospel, *hic locus facilior esset, si nemo eum exposuisset*, it had been more plain and perspicuous if these distinctions had been omitted. I see not how a man could imagine any other sence then this. *That God according to his gracious Covenant doth in his appointed time, give, or send his Spirit in the preaching of the Gospell, to work Faith in all those that are ordained to life*; So that the Spirit is the cause, and Faith the effect. It matters not how he is given, whe-

[o] *Cotton* in sw. to *Baily*. p. 36.

ther Personally or Operatively; for if the Spirit which works Faith be given us by vertue of the New Covenant, then some benefit of the Covenant is bestowed upon us before we believe; *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

§. 5. Though the Spirit be not given us (as he saith) one atome of time before we believe; yet that weakens not the force of the Argument; it is enough for my purpose that it hath a precedency in order of nature, though not of time; and that Faith is not before the Spirit, for then Faith is not the condition of the Covenant, (seeing the condition goes before the thing conditioned) and consequently, that conditional Promise, *If thou believe, &c.* is not the tenor of the New Covenant: Either he must say (1) That the Spirit doth not work Faith; and that it is a work of Nature, to wit, of our own Free will, contrary to innumerable Scriptures. Or (2) That the Spirit which works Faith, is not given us by vertue of the New Covenant; which was disproved by comparing *Joh.* 6. 45. with *Jer.* 31. 34. & is contrary to those Scriptures, which affirmed that all spiritual blessings are given us in and through Christ, *Eph.* 1. 3. *Rom.* 8. 32. Or (3) that there is some other condition of the Covenant, besides and before Faith, as they [p] that make *Animæ* ingenuitas, ingenuity and towardlinesse of nature, the condition of conversion, or (4) that there are two New Covenants, one absolute, and the other conditional, one, wherein Faith is promised without condition; the other, wherein all things else are promised upon condition of Faith; of which more in its place.

[p] Dr. *Ham.* let. to Dr. *Cheyn.* p. 118.

§. 6. Whereas he chargeth me with often abusing that received maxime, *Posita causa ponitur effectus.* Letting passe his uncivil language, I say (1) that in our discourse, I did not so much as mention it nor at any time else, but with such cautions and limitations, as Artists [q] give, understanding it of *causa proxima & completa*; and then I conceive *causa posita in actu*, the effect must necessarily follow. (2) I cannot see that it is any abuse to apply it to the death of Christ, in effecting our Justification, or deliverance from the curse; his death and satisfaction being the adequate and immediate cause therof, for when the debt is paid, the obligation is no longer in force. (3) Though I understood this maxime never so well, it wou'd little advantage Mr. *Woodbridges* cause, *That Faith is the condition of having the Spirit in our first*

[q] *Keck. syst. log.* p. 145.

conver-

conversion, unlesse it would prove that the cause is produced by its immedeate effect.

§. 7. That which follows is altogether impertinent; *as a man* (saith he) *doth first build himselfe an house, and then dwels in it, so Christ by his Spirit, doth build, organize, and prepare the Soule to be an house unto himselfe, and then by the same Spirit dwels in it immediately.* What is this to prove, that no man hath interest in the Covenant, before he beleeves; or that the Spirit, which workes Faith, is not given us before Faith? We grant that Christ by his Spirit doth κατασκευαζειν * build or prepare the Soule to be his house, and then dwels in it [r], vouchsafes more sensible effects of his presence; but is not that organizing, preparing act of the Spirit, one benefit of the Covenant? and is not the Spirit in that act, the cause of Faith? if so! then wee have an interest in the Covenant before Faith, for he that hath *jus in re*, doubtlesse hath *jus ad rem*; when wee have the benefits of the Covenant, it cannot bee denied but wee have a right and title to them. I find that [f] Mr. *Burges* mentions this answer, *but* (saith he) *it is not safe to go this way, for that grand promise*, Ezek. 36.26. *Doth evidently argue the habits or internall principles of grace, are before the actions of grace.*

§. 8. His next passage gives us little evidence of a heart prepared, and organized by the Spirit of Christ, it being false and slanderous. *This* (saith he) *is that which I would have spoken publickly in answer to the Argument, if Mr. E. had not been beyond measure obstreperous.* (1) I dare say such as know Mr. *Woodbridges* tongue and forehead, will not easily beleeve, that he would be hindred from speaking his whole mind: But (2) my innocency in this matter hath been cleared by persons [t] more worthy to be beleeved then Mr. *W.* especially when he speaks in his owne cause. (3) I shall adde, that I verily beleeve, he then spake near as many words, I am sure, as much to the purpose, as this which he hath Printed; I well remember some passages which are here omitted, as that saying, *anima fabricat sibi domicilium*, the Soul formes the Body, and then dwels in it; as the soul works first efficiently, that afterwards it may act formally, so doth the spirit in our conversion, &c. (4) If he spake no more it was his owne fault; for all that were present, doe know, that the onely an-

* Heb. 3. 3.
[r] 2 Cor. 6. 16. Joh. 14. 23.

[f] Of Justif. p. 183.

[t] See the Ep. before my Ser.

ſwer I could get unto divers Syllogiſmes was, *I deny all*: But this he intended rather to viliſie me, then to excuſe himſelfe.

CHAP. XVII.

Concerning the Covenant, wherein Faith is promiſed, and by vertue whereof it is given to us.

MR. *W.* in the next place, propoundes this Queſtion, *Whether Faith it ſelfe be not given to us by vertue of the Covenant made with us?* Which he anſwers negatively, *Faith is not given us by vertue of the Covenant made with us, but by vertue of the Covenant made with Chriſt*; His Anſwer implies, that there are two diſtinct Covenants of Grace, one made with Chriſt, and the other with us; which will need a clearer evidence, then yet he hath given us. We deny not, but Faith, yea, and all other bleſſings are promiſed in the Covenant, which was made with Chriſt, the promiſe of giving him a ſeed, and that this ſeed ſhall be bleſſed, doth include no leſſe; All the Promiſes, both of this life, and that which is to come, are but ſo many explications, of the grand promiſe, *Gen.* 12. 3. *All the Nations or Families of the Earth* [i.e. all the Elect, *whom God hath chaſen out of every kindred, and tongue, and People and Nation,*] *ſhall be bleſſed in him*, Mr *W.* ſhould have proved that theſe Promiſes were not made with us in Chriſt; he ſhould have ſhewed us any other Covenant made with the Elect, then that which was made with Chriſt. We ſay with the Apoſtle, *that all the Promiſes of God are yea and amen in him*, 2 Cor. 1. 20. and with the late Aſſembly, *that the Covenant of Grace was made with Chriſt and with us in him*, With him actively, as the perſon that performed all the conditions, upon which the Promiſes thereof are grounded; with us paſſively, as the perſons to whom the benefit of thoſe Promiſes doth belong [a]. If one man promiſe another, that in caſe he ſhall beat ſo many ſtripes, indure ſo long impriſonment, or performe any other condition, be it what it will, he will then take care of and provide for his children, doth not this promiſe which was made with the Father, moſt properly belonging unto his children?

Rev. 5. 9.

[a] See M. Kend. vind. c. 18. p. 7.

children? The case is the same between Christ and us; he performed the conditions, and we receive the benefits of the New Covenant; the same Covenant is made with both, and consequently Faith is given us, not onely by vertue of the Covenant made with Christ, but by vertue of the Covenant made with all the Elect; which might be further proved by many Reasons.

Sect. 1. If there be but one Covenant of Grace, which is made both with Christ and us, then Faith is given us by vertue of the Covenant made with us: But there is but one Covenant of Grace, *Ergo*, The Sequel is undeniable, I doubt not but our adversaries will grant, that Faith is given us by vertue of the Covenant of Grace; and the Assumption is as evident, that there is but one Covenant of Grace; though there are many promises, yet is there but one Covenant: For as much as all the promises have the same ground and foundation, *scil.* the merit and purchase of Jesus Christ; and therefore they are said to be *yea, and amen in him*. The Scripture makes mention but of two Covenants; the Covenant of Works; and the Covenant of Grace; the former was made with the first *Adam*, and his Seed; the other with the second *Adam*, and his Seed, and is commonly called the New Covenant. I confess this latter hath been variously administred in the times of the Old and New Testament; In which respect it hath been looked upon by some, as two distinct Covenants, and distinguished by the names of the Old and New Covenant. But this controversie is easily reconciled, if it be considered, that the Old Covenant is sometimes put for the promise vailed, and sometimes for the vail it self. (1) When it is put for the vail it self (as doubtless it is, when it is said to have *waxen old*, and *to vanish, to be changed, abolished, disannulled*, &c. Which things cannot be affirmed of the promise, which is an Everlasting Covenant, and always remains one and the same) it may be said to be a distinct Covenant from the Covenant of Grace, exhibited in the times of the New Testament. But (2) when it is taken for the promise vailed, there is no doubt, but it is the same in substance with that in the New Testament; for though this Grace was then but darkly revealed, and as it were covered out of sight by the Mosaical Administration, yet it brought upon them the same Righteousness and Salvation, which is now enjoyed by the children of Faith,

[b] Vid. Calvin. Inst. l. 2. c. 2. sect 4.

Acts

Acts 15. 11. *John* 8. 36. *Gal.* 3. 8. and *Heb.* 11. 14. But be the Old and New Testament Administration, one, or two Covenants, it matters not much to our Question; it lies on Mr. *W.* to prove, that there are two New Covenants, or two distinct Covenants of Grace in the times of the New Testament; one made with Christ, and another with the Elect; one, in which God doth promise us Faith; the other, in which he doth promise, all other Blessings, that follow Faith; which, I suppose, he will finde to be somewhat difficult.

§. 3. 2. If Christ merited nothing for himself, but onely for the Elect, then all the promises made to him do belong to them, or the Covenant which was made with him as Mediator, is made with them: But Christ merited nothing for himself, *Ergo*. The *Minor* is the unanimous Tenent of our Protestant Divines, who have sufficiently cleared it from the Scriptures. And for my own part, I see not what can be rationally excepted against the consequence of the *Major*; for if he merited nothing for himself, then all the promises made to him, do belong to others: In this regard he is called *The Mediator of a better Covenant*, Heb. 8. 6. *and the Mediator of the New Covenant*, *Chap.* 12. 24. Now a Mediator doth not act for himself, but in their behalf, whose Mediator he is. I suppose Mr. *W.* will not deny, but Faith is bestowed upon us by vertue of that Covenant, whereof Christ is the Mediator: Now Christ is Mediator of the Covenant made with us, and not of a Covenant, made singly and particularly with himself, for a man cannot properly be called a Mediator for himself. The Apostle is express, That we obtain Faith by the same means, whereby we obtain all good things else, to wit, *By the Righteousness of Jesus Christ*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 1. *Eph.* 1. 3. *Rom.* 8. 32. So that consequently it is one and the same Covenant, by vertue whereof, Faith, and all other Spiritual Blessings are bestowed upon us. I adde therefore.

§. 4. 3. If Faith be given to us by vertue of that Covenant, whereby Justification, Sanctification, Perseverance, and Glory, are bestowed upon us, then Faith is given us by vertue of that Covenant which is made with us: But Faith is given us by vertue of the same Covenant, wherein Justification, Sanctification, *&c.* are promised and bestowed upon us, *Ergo*. Neither Sequel nor Assumption,

tion, do need any proof: In the same Covenant wherein God promiseth *to cleanse us from our filthiness, to cause us to walk in his ways, &c.* He promiseth *to circumcise our hearts, to write his Laws in our inward parts, and that we shall be taught of God* (*i.e.* Made to believe, *John* 6. 45.) *Ezek.* 36. 25, *&c. Jere.* 31. 34.

§. 5. 4. If Faith be given to us by vertue of that Covenant which was made with *Abraham*, and his Seed, then is it given by vertue of the Covenant made with us: For the same Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, is made with all the faithful to the end of the world; and therefore they are called the *children of Abraham*, *Gal.* 3. 7, 29. Now God in promising to *be his God, and to be a Sun, and a shield, &c.* promised also to give Faith, whereby the Refreshing Beams of this Sun are conveyed into the soul, and this shield is managed for our best advantage, *Ephes.* 6. 16.

5. (Which was the *medium* I made use of at our Conference) If Faith be given us by vertue of the Covenant made with the House of *Israel*, then is it given us by vertue of the Covenant made with us; for the House of *Israel* is the whole company of Gods Elect, who are therefore called *Spiritual Israel*, *Rom.* 9. 6. But Faith, or the Spirit which works Faith, is promised in the Covenant made with the House of *Israel*, *Jere.* 31. 31. *Heb.* 8. 19.

§. 6. Whereunto Mr. *W.* answers (1) by way of retortion, *If Mr.* E. (saith he) *will urge the words of this Text rigorously, they would prove more then he would have:* I hope there is no hurt in that, though the place doth prove more, that doth no whit invalidate its force, as to the purpose for which we alledged it; but what is that, which it proves more? *It is manifest* (says he) *that this Covenant contains a promise of sending Christ into the world, to die for our sins, as the Apostle proves*, Heb. 10. 14, 15, 16. *So that we may as well infer from hence, that we are in Covenant with God before the death of the Mediator, as that we are in Covenant before we believe; and then his death shall serve not to obtain all, or any of the blessings of the Covenant, but onely* (*as the Socinians*) *to declare and confirm, &c.*

If he please to admit of a Reply, we say, (1) That he mistakes

the inference, that was drawn from hence: The Proposition to be concluded, was not, *That we are in Covenant before we believe*; but, *that Faith, or the Spirit which works Faith, is given us by vertue of the Covenant made with us*, which is sufficiently secured by these Texts; for if by the House of *Israel* be meant, all the Elect (as undoubtedly they are) and the Spirit which works Faith, is promised in the Covenant which is made with the House of *Israel*, then the Spirit, and Faith, are given by vertue of the Covenant which is made with us, we being in the number of Gods Elect. (2) It is not so manifest (as he pretends) that these Texts do contain a promise of sending Christ to die for us. The promises here mentioned, do express only what benefits do accrew to us by the Death of Christ: I grant, that this Covenant supposeth the Death of Christ, as the onely meritorious procuring means, by which these benefits do flow down unto us; and therefore it is said, *In those days*, or *after those days*, meaning the days of the Son of Man, when the Messiah, whom God had promised, should be exhibited; which in Scripture are called, *The last days, the last times, and the world to come, &c.* Though the Apostle mentions the Covenant, *Heb.* 10. 15. it is not to prove, That God would send his Son to die, but that being come (as these believing *Hebrews* acknowledged, though they saw not the vertues of his death, as to the abolishing of other Sacrifices) he hath offered up a perfect Sacrifice, *Verse* 10, 12, 14. and consequently they needed no other Sacrifice to take away sin; for otherwise God had not made such ample promises, in reference to the times of the Messiah, as you finde he hath, *Jere.* 31. *That he will remember the sins and iniquities of his people no more, &c. For* (says the Apostle) *when there is such a full remission, there needs no more offering for sin*, Verse 18.

§. 7. 3. Though we should grant him that this Text, *Jere.* 31. contains a promise of sending Christ; what were this to the purpose, to weaken our inference, *That Faith is given by vertue of the Covenant made with us?* May not God in the same Covenant, promise both Christ and Faith? *But* (sayes Mr. *W.*) *it will follow then, that this Covenant was made with us, or that we were in Covenant with God, not onely before we believe, but before the death of Christ.* I am so far from looking upon it as

an

an absurdity, that I shall readily own, and acknowledge it as an undeniable truth; *That the New Covenant was made with all the Elect in Christ, before the foundation of the world were laid*; it being, *the fixed and immutable will of God, concerning all those good things, which in time are bestowed upon them*; and therefore it is called an *Everlasting Covenant*; 2 *Sam.* 23. 5. not onely a *pacto post*, but a *pacto ante*; as it shall have no end, not be changed: So it had no beginning, God having from all eternity, immutably purposed in himself, to bestow upon them all those blessings which they do receive in time; yet we say there are more especially three moments, or periods of time, wherein God may be said to make this Covenant with us: As (1) immediately upon the fall of *Adam*, when he first published his gracious promise of saving all his Elect by the woman's Seed, *Gen.* 3. 15. The first Covenant being broken and dissolved, the Lord immediately published that other Covenant which cannot be broken; and hereunto (as hath been shewed) do those Scriptures relate, *Tit.* 1. 2. 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. (2) At the death of Christ; because thereby all the benefits willed to us by the *Everlasting Covenant*, were merited and procured for us; the full price which was paid for them, was then exhibited; for which cause, the New Covenant is called διαθήκη, a *Testament*, which was confirmed by the death of the Testator Jesus Christ, *Heb.* 9. 17. And the Blood which he shed, *the Blood of the Everlasting Covenant*, Heb. 13. 20. *and the Blood of the New Testament*, *Matth.* 26. 28. So that his charge of Socinianism, doth not touch us; for though we do not say, That Christ procured the Covenant, or that God should will to us those mercies which are therein promised; yet we say, the effects of the Covenant, or the mercies themselves, were all of them obtained by the Blood of Christ, as our deliverance from the curse, inherent holiness, *&c.* (3) The Covenant is said to be made with men, when God doth confer upon men the benefits which are therein promised, or at least makes them to know and understand their interest and propriety therein. Thus is that to be understood, *Isai.* 55. 3. *I will make an Everlasting Covenant*, *i. e.* I will fulfil my Everlasting Covenant, or bestow upon you, all those mercies which I have promised, and which my Son hath purchased by shedding of his Blood. And thus we grant, That God makes

[c] See Dr. Reynolds on Psal. 110. 4.

[d] Gen. 17. 7. 2 Chron. 13. 5. Psal. 89. 34. & 28. Isa. 54. 9. & 55. 3. Jere. 33. 20.

his Covenant with his people, when he gives them Faith, when he enables them to lay hold of it, and to plead it at the Throne of Grace: now though in this sence God may be said to take men into Covenant, when they doe beleeve, yet will it not follow that the Spirit and Faith are not given by vertue of the Covenant which is made with us; so that his retortion is pittifully unsuccessefull, it gives not the least wound to the cause which we maintain.

§. 8. The second branch of his Answer is, *That upon a most serious perusall of these Texts, I finde them so contradictory to Mr. Eyres purpose, that I cannot but wonder what hee means to shelter his Opinion under the protection of it*: I must needs say, that after a most serious perusing of his papers, I cannot be perswaded to be of his mind, to think that these places are contradictory to the purpose, for which I brought them, but rather that they doe give infull evidence to the Proposition which I was to prove, *viz. That the Spirit, which works Faith is given us by vertue of the Covenant made with us*; But how doth Mr. *W.* prove the contradiction? *We shall find* (saith he) *in these words three things of distinct consideration, the Conclusion of which is the only support of this feeble Argument.* I cannot but wonder (and so I dare say doth the impartiall Reader) that Mr. *W.* should say the Text is contradictory to my purpose, and yet confesse, that it affords support unto my Argument; for though no more then that, which he cals, the *Conclusion of the Text* doth afford it shelter, yet is that sufficient to clear it from the guilt of a contradiction. But what are the three things which he finds in these Texts to ground his charge on? 1. (says he) *There is the matter and blessings of the Covenant on Gods part*, I will be their God, and they shall be my People; *in which words, as many blessings temporall, and eternall are promised; so peculiarly pardon of sin, &c.* 2. *There is expressed the bond and condition of it, on our part, and that is Faith, which is signified in those words, of putting Gods* Laws in our minds, and writing them in our hearts. *In these two things is the tenor, and formality of the new Covenant; they that beleeve, the Lord will be their God, and they shall be his People. But* 3. (says he) *there is also a promise that God will worke this condition, by which men shall have an interest in this Covenant, and a right and title to the blessings of it*; I will put my Laws,

Laws into their minds, *I will give them faith; which Faith is not promised as an effect of the Covenant already made, but as the means by which we are brought into Covenant, and thereby invested in a right to all the blessings of it*, &c. should I grant all that he saith, yet would it not one whit weaken our Assertion, that this Covenant is made with us, who are meant by the *house of Israel*; and that the Spirit which works Faith is promised in this Covenant, which Mr. *W.* cannot deny, though hee would thrust it behind the doore, saying, *that it is promised in the Covenant, but not as a part of the Covenant*; I might easily shew, that there are not so many lines as mistakes, in this short discourse; I professe I cannot but wonder at his boldnesse, that he durst for his advantage to wrest, and falsifie the words and tenor of the Covenant, excluding the promise of Faith from the matter and blessings of it, which is expressed more then once in these few words, as in this clause, *ver.* 33. *I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts*, by his own confession: And in that also *ver.* 34. *They shall know me*, which our Saviour expounds of beleeving in him. But to take things as they lie.

1 We deny that the whole matter, and all the benefits of the Covenant on Gods part are confined to these words, *I will be their God, and they shall be my people*; for though *omne bonum, est in summo bono*, and when this promise is put alone, it may comprehend as much as Mr. *W.* [illegible] yet when other promises are joyned with it, it denotes [illegible] particular blessing; either it relates to the formall part of mans happinesse, which consists in the fruition and enjoyment of God, or the knowledge of our interest and propriety in him [c]. Thus, *I will be their God*, is as much as, they shall know that I am their God, and that they are my people [*]; Or else, *I will be their God, &c.* imports as much as, I will protect them, and they shall worship me [f]. But say this Promise be as large as Mr. *W.* would make it, though all blessings temporall and eternal be more generally included in it, yet that hinders not, but the other promises annexed thereunto, doe also exhibit the matter and blessings of the New Covenant [g]. The same things often times in the Scripture are expressed, first more generally, and then more particularly.

[c] Dr. *Stoughton* Ser. on Pl. 4. 6.
[*] Hos. 2. 23. Cant. 2. 16.
[f] *Calv. Diodat.*
[g] Vid. *Calv.* in Jer. 32. 38, 39.

§. 10. 2. It is apparently false, that in these words, *I will put*

my Laws in their minds, and write them in their hearts, is expressed the bond and condition of the Covenant on our part; for the words are a promise, and not a precept; the Lord declares what he himselfe will doe for them. If Mr. *W.* frees a condition in these words, he hath found more then all the Divines that ever I met with. Dr. *Twisse* (his Predecessor) in his Answer to *Arminius's* Preface [h], reciting the tenor of the Covenant, as it is in this place of *Jeremy*, *Isa.* 32. and *Ezek.* 36. challengeth him to shew *vel levissimam mentionem conditionis*. Dr. *Preston* [i] speaking of the Covenant which God hath made with his Elect, sayes, that it is *Absolute*, and not conditionall; for which he alleadgeth this place of *Jeremy*, *Ezek.* 36. &c. A learned man of the late Assembly in a Sermon before the Parliament then sitting [k], declared, That all the promises of the New Covenant are absolute, not onely *citra meritum*, but *citra conditionem*, without any pre-required conditions of us; amongst many other places he cites this Text. Besides this, I might adde abundance more. But I beleeve Mr. *Baxter* is *instar omnium* with Mr. *W.* Now he acknowledgeth [l], that this Text, with the like, doth expresse an absolute Covenant. Mr. *W.* might as well say, that the bond and condition of the Covenant on our part is expressed in these words, *they shall be my people*, or in the other clause, *I will be their God*, interpreting it by that of *Hosea* 2. 23. *They shall say, I am their God*; which one (I remember) would have to be the condition of the Covenant on our part; so that according to the [illegible]ns Interpretations, the New Covenant shall consist only of conditions; or of precepts imposed upon us, without so much as one Promise of mercy to us; and consequently, the Covenant of Grace shall exhibit no Grace at all; or at most, much lesse then the Covenant of Works doth. If the Lord had meant that these words, *I will write my Laws in their hearts, &c.* should be the bond of the Covenant on our part, he would have expressed it in such a manner, *If my Lawes be written in your hearts, I will be your God*; the words are plainly a promise of Sanctification, which is one principall benefit of the New Covenant.

§. 11. Whereas he adds, *That God doth here promise to work Faith, which Faith is not promised as an effect of the Covenant, but as the means, by which we are brought into Covenant*; It being so,

[h] Sect. 8. not. 6.

[i] Serm. 2. of Faith p. 38.

[k] Mr. *Strong* Ser. on 1 Sam. 2. 30.

[l] Append p. 41, 42.

so crudely asserted, a base denial might serve the turn. But (1) I shall appeal to the indifferent Reader, whether it doth not sound very harshly, That the same words should be formally both a precept and a promise, and that God should require a condition of us, and yet promise to work it in us? How shall we distinguish between precepts and promises? *Mr. W.* may be pleased to consider, what some Grand Assertors of Conditions have said thereof[m]. (2) I would ask, whether this promise of Faith be not a part of the New Covenant? All the promises of God do belong, either to the Covenant of Works, or to the Covenant of Grace: It is no part of the Covenant of Works. *Ergo*, It is a part of the Covenant of Grace. Now if the promise be a part of the New Covenant, the thing promised is an effect of the Covenant; or a benefit given, by vertue of it. (3) I would ask, whether the promise of Faith, be not an effect of Christs death? If it be, then is it an effect of the Covenant already made; for all the effects of his death, are effects of the Covenant, which was confirmed by his death; who, for this cause is called *the Covenant*, *Isa.* 42. 6. & 49. 8. implying, That all the benefits of the Covenant, are the fruits and purchases of his death; and that Christ hath not purchased any thing for us, but what is promised in the Covenant; the effects of the Covenant, and the effects of Christs death are of equal latitude. (4) The Scripture no where affirms, That Faith is promised as a means to bring us into Covenant, or to invest us with a right and title thereunto. That which gives men interest in the Covenant, is the good pleasure of God, willing those blessings to them; and the purchase which Christ hath made in their behalf, who hath performed whatsoever was necessary by Divine constitution, in order to our having of them. We grant, That Faith is the means whereby we come to know our interest in the Covenant, and in all the benefits thereof: But their saying, *That hereby we have, or do obtain our interest and title to the Covenant*, hath no any ground that I finde in the Written Word. If any shall infer it from hence, because it is said, *Believe, and thou shalt be saved*; they may as well make Baptism, Sanctification, Perseverance, &c. (to which the promise of Salvation is sometimes annexed) means, to bring us into Covenant, or to invest us with a right and title to the benefits of it, and consequently no

[m] Sup. c. 14. sect. 9.

man

man ſhall have any intereſt in the Covenant as long as he lives, and till theſe conditions be performed. To conclude, If the promiſe of Faith be a part of the Covenant, (as hath been ſhewed) then is it not a means to bring us into Covenant, or to inveſt us with a title to the benefits of it, becauſe it is impoſſible that the ſame thing ſhould be the means, or cauſe of it ſelf.

CHAP. XVIII.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *Expoſition of the New Covenant, (mentioned* Jere.31.33. *and in other places) is further examined.*

THe Tenor of the New Covenant, in the Prophet (whoſe words are punctually cited by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 8.) runs thus, *This is the Covenant that I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael; *after thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they ſhall be my people; and, &c.* But now Mr. *W.* renders it thus, [*This is the Covenant which I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael; *when I ſhall write my Laws in their hearts, I will be their God, &c.* or, *This is the Covenant, which I will make, ſaith the Lord, that giveth his Laws into their mindes, and writeth them in their hearts, &c.*] I know not what can be called wreſting of the Scripture, if this be not: If men may take the liberty, to chop and change, to adde or diminiſh from the Word, at their pleaſure, nothing can certainly be concluded thence; nay, the Scripture might be made a ſhelter for the fouleſt Errors. It ſavors not of a ſpirit, that trembles at the Word, and believes that threatning, *Revel.* 22.18. to make ſo bold with the Oracles of God. The word [*when*] is neither in, nor agreeable to the *Hebrew*, or *Greek* Text, though he would make his Reader believe, that it is in both. The Verbs in the firſt clauſe, are not in the Preſent, but Future tenſe, as in the reſt which follow. Beſides his Paraphraſe, chargeth the Holy Ghoſt, with a groſs

grosse tautology, if not a flat contradiction. The time of making this Covenant is signified in these words, [*After those days*] which undoubtedly ought to be referred unto the days of the Messiah, in opposition to the times before, when the Grace of this Covenant was not so clearly revealed; so that it was needless he should adde [*When I put my Laws, &c.*] And if God makes not this Covenant with Spiritual *Israel*, till he writes his Laws in their hearts, then the former clause [*After those days*] must either stand for nothing, or else imply a falsehood. In a word, The unsoundness of this glose, doth appear from hence, that these words are not only here, but in many other places, mentioned as a distinct promise of the New Covenant, and not as a bare computation of the time, or a *Periphrasis* of the person, that makes the Covenant, as Mr. *W.* cavils. See *Deut.* 30. 6. *Ezek.* 36. 26, 27. *Jer.* 31. 33, 39. where that promise, which Mr. *W.* calls, *The main and very substance of the Covenant on Gods part*, is put first, and the other which he calls the Condition, is made as it were, the Consequence of the former.

§. 2. The Scriptures he hath brought to countenance his new found interpretation of the Covenant, will by no means shelter it; as *Jere.* 24. 7. *I will give them a heart to know me, that I am the Lord, and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; for they shall return unto me with their whole heart.* [*Where* (says he) *the condition on the peoples part* of the Lords being their God, *is, their returning with their whole heart.*] The affirmation is not so clear, as not to need a proof; that promise, *I will give them a heart to know me*, is (as hath been shewed,) one principal blessing of the New Covenant, the immediate effect whereof is, *Mens returning unto God with their whole heart.* Now to call their *returning unto God*, the condition of *Gods being their God*, is as unhappy a mistake, as his, That set the Cart before the horse. Could they have returned to God, unless God had returned to them*? Are not Faith and Repentance, the fruits of our Reconciliation, by the blood of Christ? *God having given us his Son, hath with him given us all things else, Rom.* 8. 32. Mr. *Calvin* calls this blessing, of *Gods being our God*, *Causam & principium omnium bonorum*, i. e. The cause and fountain of all other blessings; and particularly, *of the renewing*

* 1 John 4. 10, 19.

of our hearts, and our returning unto God. Now the conſequences and Effects of a Bleſſing, are not the Conditions of it.

§. 3. His next Allegation from *Heb.* 10. 14, &c. hath the ſate, to fall as ſhort of the mark, as the former did. For the Apoſtles ſcope there, is not to ſhew in what order and method, the benefits of the Covenant are beſtowed upon us, but that there needs no other Sacrifice for ſin, beſides the Sacrifice which Chriſt hath offered; which he proves, becauſe God in that Covenant, which he promiſed to make with his people in the times of the New Teſtament, declares, That he will not only *give them a new heart*, but *their ſins and iniquities ſhall not be remembred any more.* Now where there is no more remembrance of ſin, there needs no more Sacrifice for ſin; ſo that the words expreſſed, are ſufficient to compleat the ſenſe without underſtanding of [*then he ſaith*] or [*then it followeth*] which Mr. *W.* hath added in the cloſe of the ſixteenth Verſe. We may take them as they lie, from Verſe the fifteenth. *Whereof* (to wit, of Chriſts perfect Sacrifice, mentioned Verſ. 14.) *the Holy Ghoſt is a witneſs to us; for after he, i. e.* the Holy Ghoſt, *had ſaid before, This is the Covenant that I will make with them, after thoſe days,* (to wit, of the Old Teſtament, which are now expired) *The Lord ſaith,* (*viz.* The holy Ghoſt, who is the Lord *Jehovah*, and with the Father and Son, the Author of the New Covenant,) *I will put my Laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their ſins and iniquities will I remember no more.* So that I ſay, there is no need that either of thoſe clauſes [*Then he ſaith*, &c.] ſhould be inſerted in between the 16 and 17 Verſes. It ſeems to me, That the Copulative [*And*] is ſet as a bar, to keep it forth, ſhewing that the words in the 17 Verſe, ought to follow immediately upon the ſixteenth. I grant that the promiſe of Remiſſion, is one of the *moſt ſpecial, and noble Bleſſings*, contained in that general promiſe, *I will be their God*; yet it doth not follow, that Regeneration or Inherent holineſs is required or promiſed, as the means or qualification, to obtain this Bleſſing. *Pareus* his Note upon the place is very ſound, That the Apoſtle here, doth ground the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins, upon that perfect oblation which Chriſt hath offered, and not upon works of Sanctification, which (according to

Pareus. Ioan. Diſkion.

Vid. Calv in loc.

Mr.

Mr. *Woodbridges* Doctrine) is the immediate principle, from whence it follows.

§. 4. His next Aſſertion [*That in the New Covenant, the giving of the firſt Grace, is always promiſed, not as part of the Covenant, but as a means and qualification on mans part, for his entrance into Covenant,*] is juſtly obnoxious unto more then one Exception.

1. The work of Converſion, or the renewing of our hearts, is unduly called *The firſt Grace*; For (1) to ſpeak properly, the firſt Grace, is that, which is Grace indeed, to wit, the Everlaſting Love, Favor, and Good-pleaſure of God towards his people; for this is the riſe and fountain of all thoſe mercies, which we receive in time, yea, of Chriſt himſelf, *John* 3. 16. Or (2) if by Grace, we underſtand the Fruits and Effects of this Grace, then certainly the preheminence or priority muſt be given unto Jeſus Chriſt, for whoſe ſake all other bleſſings are beſtowed upon us, *Epheſ.* 1. 3. Or elſe (3) if by Grace we underſtand the Fruits and Effects of Chriſts death, or the benefits which are freely given us for his ſake, even in this ſenſe, Inherent Sanctification is unduly put in the firſt place, which is a conſequent, both of Juſtification and Adoption, *Gal.* 4. 5, 6. Though it be promiſed in that place of *Jeremy*, before Remiſſion of ſins, yet in other places it is put after it; as *Ezek.* 36. 25, 26. *Jer.* 32. 38, 39. The Reaſon why this promiſe is ſometimes put firſt, may probably be, becauſe the Grace of Sanctification is moſt apt to affect our ſenſes, we do apprehend and perceive it, before we come to know our Juſtification.

b *Dowh* of Juſtit. l 3. c. 2.

§. 5. 2. It is utterly falſe, *That the giving of a new heart, is not promiſed as a part of the Covenant; but as a means on mans part, for his entrance into Covenant.* For (1) the Scripture no where affirms it; and it is weakly concluded hence, becauſe it is ſometimes mentioned, firſt, in the recital of the Covenant, which is all he hath to pretend for this notion, ſeeing that in other places, the promiſe of Sanctification, follows that of Juſtification; from whence he may as well conclude, that Juſtification is promiſed not as a part of the Covenant, but as a means to intitle us unto Sanctification; ſo that not onely, the promiſe of Faith, but of Remiſſion alſo ſhall be excluded from being a part of the Covenant.

(2) The promise of a new heart, includes not onely the first act of Faith and Repentance, but the continuance and increase of these Gifts; so that either he must say, that all the Promises of Sanctification, which are included therein, are no part of the Covenant; or that the same promise is both a means to bring us into Covenant, and a part of the Covenant, *i. e.* it is a part, and no part. I must confess, that I never yet met with that man, who had the forehead to deny, that the promise of Faith, and Repentance, is a part of the New Covenant. (3) It seems to me an undeniable truth, that the promises of Sanctification as well as of Justification, are parts of the Covenant; considering (1) that they have the same ground and foundation, to wit, the merit and purchase of Jesus Christ; Christ hath merited Faith and Repentance, no less then remission of sins. Now whatsoever Christ hath purchased, the Covenant promiseth; All the effects of his death, are equally parts of the New Covenant. (2) Both these promises have the same end and design, *viz.* The glory of God. Faith and Repentance are not promised onely subserviently for our benefit, but ultimately for the praise of his glory, *Tit.* 3. 14. 1 *Thes.* 4. 3. (3) They are promised in the same manner, as distinct, and not as subordinate benefits; he doth not say, *I will write my Laws in their hearts*, that *I may* pardon their sins and iniquities. But *I will write my Laws, &c. and their sins and iniquities, I will remember no more.*

§. 6. 3. It sounds harshly, *That God promiseth Faith, as a means on our part, to bring us into Covenant*; for if God doth promise to bestow Faith, it cannot properly be called a means on our part, it were a means on our part, if we performed it our selves, and by our own strength, as the condition required of *Adam*, should have been. For the removing of this rub, I shall make it to appear; that in the New Covenant, there is no condition required on our part, to give us a right, and title to the blessings of it: But before we proceed, we will give the Reader a brief account of those other Scriptures which Mr. *W.* hath alledged to prove, That Faith is promised, not as a part of the Covenant, but as a means on our part, to obtain the remission of sins: All which I finde have the same misfortune as the rest, not to be able to bring forth the conclusion, which his fancy hath begotten on them.

That

That in *Ezek.* 36. 25, 26, 27, 28. makes quite against him; for there the Lord first promiseth to justifie us, in those phrases of *pouring out clean water upon us, and of cleansing us from all our filthinesses*, Verse 25. and then to renew or sanctifie us, Vers. 26, 27. So that there is no colour to infer from hence, that Sanctification, or any part thereof, is promised as a means to initiate us to Justification.

§. 7. The other two Texts, are much to the same purpose, *scil. Ezek.* 11. 19, 20. and *chap.* 37. 23, 24, 26, 27. where the Lord after he had promised unto his people many particular blessings (as that *he would give them a new heart, take away their stony heart, make them walk in his Statutes and Ordinances, that they should no more defile themselves with Idols*, that David, i. e. Christ, *should be their King and Shepherd, that his Tabernacle should be with them*, i. e. He would dwell in them, and walk in them, 2 Cor. 6. 16.) He tells them, *That he will be their God, and they shall be his people*; from whence Mr. *W.* would gather, *That God promiseth Faith, not as a part of the Covenant, but as a means to bring us into Covenant; that God may be our God.* How rational this Deduction is, let the Reader judge, for if that promise, *I will be their God*, must be taken exclusively; so that the promises preceding, are no part of the Covenant, then the promises of Justification, Sanctification, Perseverance, *&c.* must be excluded from being parts of the Covenant. If he sayes, that it onely excludes Faith, I would ask *quô jure*, what reason is there, that it should exclude Faith, more then the other promises preceding? If it includes the rest, why not this? But to draw to a conclusion, we say, that this promise, *I will be their God, and they shall be my people*, may be taken, either (1) more generally, as comprehending all good things whatsoever, as if the Lord after the enumeration of many particular benefits, had summed up all in this, *I will be their God*, *q. d.* They may expect as much good from me, as the living God can bestow upon his people, even this that hath been mentioned, and all things else; and in this sence the promise of Faith, or the Spirit which works Faith, is included in it; or (2) it may be taken more restrictively, as noting some particular benefit and priviledge distinct from the rest, as that they shall worship him, and he will protect and provide for

them; or else, that they shall not onely have an interest in God, but that they shall know it, and live in the comfort of it.

§. 8. In the next place, Mr. *W.* offers me his service, to new mold my Argument, and to cast it into a better form, as thus, *They concerning whom God hath promised, that he will give them Faith, they are in Covenant before they believe; but concerning the Elect, God hath promised that he will give them Faith, Ergo.* But *pace tanti viri*, I shall not accept his courtesie, if he hath any minde to it, as I have framed it, the Law is open, he may try his skill; onely he may be pleased to remember, that these Texts, *Jere.*31.8. *Heb.* 8. were not brought to prove that we are in Covenant before we believe; but that the Spirit which works Faith, is given by vertue of the Covenant made with us: As for that Argument which from these Texts he hath advanced against us, together with the Auxiliaries, which he hath placed in the rear, I shall presently attend their motion, having first given in my evidence, to the cause depending, *That the New Covenant is not conditional, and that in it, God doth not require any restipulation from us, to intitle us to the blessings of it.* The contrary Assertion, I conceive, is the *magnum dolus* of his whole discourse: For if there be no condition, or restipulation required in the New Covenant, there will be no need, to make Faith the means of our entrance into Covenant, nor any absurdity in saying that our Justification in the sight of God precedes Faith.

CHAP. XIX.

Wherein is shewn, That in the New Covenant there are no conditions required of us, to invest us with a Right and Title, to the blessings of it.

BEfore I do give the Reasons of this Assertion, I must crave the Readers patience, whilest I tell him (1) what I mean by the New Covenant, and (2) what I understand by a condition.

1. By the New Covenant, I mean that engagement which God hath

hath laid upon himself, to bestow on them for whom Christ hath died, all good which is commensurate to their nature, and by vertue whereof all blessings Corporal, Spiritual, and Eternal, do flow down unto them. I call it an Engagement, because God by promising makes himself a debtor, though not to us, yet unto himself; being bound in justice to perform his Word and Promise. There are two principal Engagements, which God hath laid upon himself, in order to our Eternal Happiness, to one of which all his promises may be reduced. The first is that Covenant which he made with the first *Adam* in the time of his innocency; wherein God promised us life, upon condition of our perfect obedience: This is called a Covenant of Works, because the effects thereof do depend upon our works; the promise is not in force, nor have we any right to the blessings, until all those works are performed which are here required. Now this Covenant (saith the Apostle) *became weak through the flesh*, i.e. It was altogether unable to give us life, by reason of our default, and not performing the condition required of us; we have no benefit at all by this engagement, and therefore the Lord made another Covenant with the second *Adam*, that upon the making of his soul an offering for sin, he would give unto his Seed, *viz.* All the Elect, Eternal life, i.e. All good things whatsoever which they stand in need of. Now this we call *The New Covenant*, because it succeeded in the place of the other; and the *Covenant of Grace*, because all the effects thereof, do flow down unto us, meerly from the favor of God, and the merit of Christ. All the mercies we receive, they are the fruits and effects of this engagement, *Zech.* 9. 11. It is the onely plea we can use to God, both for the things of this life, and that which is to come; and by vertue hereof, we may claim and confidently expect from him all things whatsoever which we stand in need of, and are good for us. Now I say, that Promise or Covenant by vertue whereof, we obtain both Grace and Glory, good things, present and future, is not conditional to us; I say, to us; for to Christ it was conditional, though to us it be free; to him it was a Covenant of Works, though to us it be a Covenant of pure Grace; there is not so much as one blessing doth descend to us, but he hath dearly bought it, even with the price of his own blood; for which cause he is called the Mediator, Witness, and Surety of the New Covenant. § 2.

§. 2. 2. When we say the New Covenant is not conditional, we understand a condition in its proper and genuine sense, as the Jurists use it, in reference to mens contracts and bargains. *A condition* (saith Dr. *Cawel*[a]) *is a rate, manner, or Law annexed to mens acts* (or grants) *staying and suspending the same, and making them uncertain, whether they shall take effect, or no.* And our English Papinian[b], *Conditio dicitur cum quid, in casum incertum, qui potest tendere ad esse, aut non esse, confertur.* To the same purpose, the Expositor of Law terms[c], *A condition is a restraint or bridle, annexed and joyned to a promise, by the performance of which, it is ratified and takes effect, and by the non-performance of it, it becomes voide,* the person to whom it is made shall receive no commodity or advantage by it: Hence is that Maxime amongst Lawyers, *Conditio ad impleri debet, priusquàm sequatur effectus, i. e.* The condition must be performed, before the Grant or Promise becomes valid. In this sense we say, The Covenant which God made with *Adam* was conditional, God annexed to the promise of Life, the condition of Obedience. *Do this, and thou shalt live*; The stability, and success of that promise, did depend upon his performing of the condition; he failing in his part, the promise became voide. Now we deny, that the blessings of the New Covenant, do depend upon this, or any other condition to be performed by us. Lawyers do distinguish of a twofold condition, (1) Antecedent, and (2) Consequent. The Antecedent condition being performed, doth get, or gain the thing, or estate made upon condition; the Consequent condition doth keep and continue it. As for instance, If I sell a man a Farm, on condition he shall pay me five hundred pounds present, and forty shillings, nay, be it but six pence *per annum* for the future; the payment of the five hundred pounds is the Antecedent condition, which gives him possession of the Farm; the forty shillings or six pence *per annum* is the Subsequent condition, and that continues his possession; and if he fail in this latter, the Estate is forfeited, and in Law I may re-enter upon the Farm, as if no such bargain had been made between us. Now we say further, That the Blessings of the New Covenant require not onely no Antecedent, but no Subsequent condition to be performed by us; there is nothing on our parts, that procures our Right and Interest, nor yet that continues and

[a] *Interpreter verbo*, condition.

[b] *F. Cook* on *Littleton*, l. 3. c. 5.

[c] *Verbo Condition.*

and maintains our interest in them: The Lord Jesus is both the Author and the Finisher of our Salvation; it is by, and through him, that we are made Sons, and doe continue Sons; are made Righteous, and doe continue Righteous; that we Obtain, and do Injoy all the effects of the New Covenant.

§. 3. I am not ignorant that the word Condition is sometimes taken improperly, for that which is meerly an Antecedent, though it contributes not the least efficiency, either natural, or morall, towards the production of that which follows it: A condition properly taken, is a moral efficient cause, which produceth its effect by vertue of some compact, agreement, or constitution between persons, *omnis conditio antecedens est effectiva*, a condition properly so called, is effective of that which is promised upon condition. Now I say, not onely conditions in a proper sense, but all certaine and constant Antecedents (though they are not expressed or included in their Federal constitution, so as that the Promise doth depend upon them) may in a vulgar sense, be called conditions of those things that follow them; and in this sense our Divines doe commonly call one benefit of the Covenant a condition of the another; as that which is given first, of that which is given after. Thus Dr. *Twisse* [d] makes inherent holinesse to be *causa dispositiva*, or the *sine qua non*, (not of Justification) but of Salvation, or Glorification, because the one alwaies precedes the other: Many other do expresse themselves in the same manner. It is evident that some benefits of the New Covenant in their execution and accomplishment doe follow others; though we have a right unto them all at once (for as much as that flowes immediately from the purchase which Christ hath made) yet we have not possession of them all at once, but in that order and manner as God is pleased to bestow them: Christ hath procured both Grace and Glory for his Elect, yet he gives Grace, i.e. Gracious Qualifications, as Knowledge, Faith, Love, &c. before he brings them to the possession of Glory; in which sense, I conceive, it is that the Scripture annexeth Salvation unto Faith, and other works of inherent Holinesse, *Matth.* 5. *pr. Heb.* 12. 14. &c. because these are certain and infallible Antecedents in all that shall be saved [e]; none (who live to years of understanding) are saved, but they that doe beleeve the Gospell, and shew forth the fruits of it in a suitable conversation: If in this sence onely, Faith and Repentance be called conditions of the Covenant, to wit, because they

[d] Vind. l. 1. part 3. sect. 7. §. 1. & alib. sæpe.

[e] See *Down.* of Justif. p. 471.

are wrought in all those that do injoy the full effect of the Covenant, I will not contend.

§.4. Yet I think it fit rather to forbear this expression, (1) Because it is so improper, to call a part of the Covenant, the condition of it, *Chamier*, though he often useth the expression, yet hee acknowledgeth that Faith is called a condition. *verbis utimur propriis* [t]; And a little after, *Fides conditio, non est antecedens sed consequens non est causa salutis, sed instrumentum apprehendendi gratiam*, i.e. *Faith is not a proper antecedent condition; but an improper or consequent condition, it is not a cause of salvation, but only the instrument whereby we receive and apply it.* Mr. *Rutherford* himselfe, though he cals them *Libertines* and *Antinomians*, who say the Covenant of Grace is not conditionall, yet almost in the same breath he hath let fall these words [u]: *To buy without money, and to have a sight of sin, is the condition of our having the water of Life, but the truth is, it is an improper condition, for both Wages and works is Free Grace.* I confesse improper locutions ought to be borne with, when they serve to illustrate truth; but this I conceive doth exceedingly darken it. (2) Because of the advantage which the adversaries of the Gospel doe make of this expression; were most of the ancient Fathers now alive, to see what use the Papists and others doe make of their unwary sayings, to patronize their Errors, I am perswaded, they would fill the world with their retractations and apologies. Have we not cause then to be careful in this matter, when we see so many profligated Errors, as Free-Will, and Universall Redemption, sheltering themselves under this expression? But (3) That which moves me most, is compassion to our vulgar hearers; who when they hear men say, that Faith, Repentance, &c. are conditions of the Covenant, understand it no otherwise then in the most common acception, and as the term Condition is used in reference to mens Contracts, and as Obedience was the condition of the first Covenant; whereby, (as *Luther* hath observed [h]) they live still in bondage, not daring to take hold of the Promise, because they doubt whether they have the condition; All their endeavors after Faith, and Holinesse are but mercinary and selfish, they would not do the work, but to get the wages.

Tom. 3. l. 15. 3. sect. 27. lib. 5. sect. 16

Trial of Faith 61.

* Com. on Gal. 4.

§.5. But this is not the matter, that is now in question, Our difference is not about words, but things, The Reader I suppose is

is sufficiently informed in what sence we deny, that the New Covenant is conditional, to wit, in that manner as the first Covenant was, which was properly conditional: and this perswasion I cannot but adhere to (notwithstanding all that I have seen or heard to the contrary) *That in the New Covenant wherein God hath promised Life and Salvation unto sinners, for whom Christ hath shed his blood; and by vertue whereof they do obtain all good things present and future: there is no condition required of them to obtain or procure the blessings that are therein promised.* For though God doth bestow upon us one blessing before another, yet he gives not any one for the sake of another, but all of them (even to our final sitting down in Glory) are given us freely for the sake of Christ; Glory it self is not only not for, *but not according to our works*, as the principle or rule, by which God proportions his reward, *but according to his own Mercy and Grace*. My Reasons for the Thesis are.

§. 6. 1. Because in all those places, wherein the nature of tenor of the New-Covenant is declared, there is not (as Dr. *Twisse*[i] hath observed) any mention at all of the least condition, as *Jer.* 31.33. *Ezek.* 36.25. &c. *Hos.* 2.18. 19.20. in all which places, with the like, God promiseth to doe all in them and for them; upon the last of those Texts *Zanchius* observes[k], *Non ait si non rejeceris, recipiam te in gratiam, & desponsabo, sed absolute* [*ego te desponsabo*] *est igitur absolutissima promissio, qua sine ulla conditione promittit Deus, se suum populum, in gratiam receptum, & servatum &c.* i.e. *He doth not say, if thou wilt repent, I will receive thee into favor, and betroth thee; but absolutely* [I will betroth thee &c.] *It is therefore a most absolute Covenant, wherein God, without any condition, doth promise that he will receive his people into favor, and save them.* The same Author in another place[l], speaking of the Covenant which God made with *Abraham, Gen.* 17.7. It is to be noted (saith he) *that this Promise is altogether free, absolute, and without any condition*, which he proves by two Arguments, one of which is, *Quoniam nullam plane in verbis foederis conditionem legimus*, i.e. *Because in the words of the Covenant we finde no condition.* And long before him that noble Champion of Grace against the *Pelagians*, *Prosper* of *Aquitan*[m] (who lived about the year 445.)

[i] Sup. c. 17. sect. 10.

[k] Tom. 5. fol. in Hos. p. 42. and 55.

[l] *De natura Dei in mo.* p. 491.

[m] De Vocat. Gen. l. 1. c. 9.

Manet prorsus & quotidie impletur quod Abrahæ dominus sine conditione promisit sine lege donavit: The Covenant (saith he) *is still in force, and is daily fulfilled, which the Lord promised unto* Abraham, *without any condition, and established without a restipulation.* Now if any shall say that these, and such like Texts do not comprize the whole, but onely a part of the New Covenant, because God doth not say, it is the whole Covenant. I Answer, (1) That it is a meer shift, like that of the Papists [h] against Justification by Faith alone, because the word [*Alone*] is not found in those Scriptures, which the Protestants doe bring to prove it. Our Divines answer, it is there virtually, and by necessary consequence, though not formally or litterally; So say I, when the Lord saith expressely, *This is my Covenant*; It is all one, as if he had said, *This is my whole Covenant.* Let our Adversaries shew us one place, where any conditional Promise is called the New Covenant, either in whole or in part. (2) That which they would make the Condition of the Covenant on our part, is expressely promised to us, no lesse then any other blessing; and their saying that it is promised in the Covenant, but not as a part of the Covenant, hath been sufficiently disproved before.

[h] Bellar. apud. Ames T. 4. l. 5. 4. sect. 9.

§. 7. 2. Because all those Covenants which God made to prefigure this Covenant, were free and absolute, without any Condition; therefore the Covenant it selfe, which was figured by them, is much more so: It is not to be questioned but the substance hath as much Grace as the shadow. Now I say in those tipicall Covenants, which God made with *Noah, Abraham, Phinehas, David, &c.* there are no Restipulations [i]. The Covenant with *Noah*, doth not run like that with *Adam*, *Do this, and live*, but, *I will not destroy the earth*, &c. *Gen.* 9. 11. I confesse *Rivet* saith the condition on *Noahs* part, was *ut juste, & integrè ambularet.* But (1) God doth not say so; the Lord doth not say, *I will make this Covenant with thee, if thou wilt walke uprightly.* (2) This Covenant was made not onely with *Noah*, but with every *living creature*, Vers. 12. Now sensitive creatures could not performe any such Condition. (3) If the benefit of that Covenant had depended upon *Noahs* upright walking, then upon *Noahs* fall, V. 21. the World should have been drowned again; as death entred

[i] Vid. Jun. or. 2 de fœd. & In loc.

into

into the world upon the non-performance of *Adams* condition. The Covenant with *Phinehas*, *Num.* 25. is not like that which God made with *Eli*, which was but a conditional and uncertain Covenant, 1 *Sam.* 2. 30. So the Covenant which God made with *David*, concerning the Kingdom, is not like the Covenant which he made with *Saul*, which was quickly voide, because it depended upon his obedience, 1 *Sam.* 13. 13, 14. which *Davids* did not; and therefore the Covenant which God made with *David*, is called *The sure mercies of David*, *Isa.* 54. 3. God promised mercies unto *Saul* as well as unto *David*, but they were not *sure mercies* [1], because they were conditional, they were promised upon conditions to be performed by him; but the Covenant with *David*, *was sure and stedfast*, *Psal.* 89. 28. because it depended not upon conditions on his part; and therefore, though he started aside as well as *Saul*, yet the Covenant made with him was not thereupon dissolved, and broken.

[1] *Preston* of Gods Immutab. p. 86.

§. 8. 3. Because if there were any condition required in the New Covenant to intitle us to the Blessings of it, it would not be a Covenant of pure Grace; so that the asserting of conditions in the New Covenant, doth by necessary consequence overthrow the nature of it; for as *Austine* hath observed, *Grace is not grace, unless it be every way free*, and the Apostle before him, *Rom.* 11. 6. *If by grace, then is it no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then is it no more grace.* Our Salvation is ascribed to Grace, not onely inclusively, but exclusively, *Ephes.* 2. 8, 9, *Tit.* 2. 5. All the Blessings of the New Covenant are called *Gifts*, *Rom.* 5. 17, 18. & 6. 23. *and gifts that are given freely*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. *Rom.* 3. 24. To give a thing freely, and conditionally, are contradictories; he that parts with any thing upon conditions, doth as it were sell it. The works and conditions which men perform, in the Prophets phrase, are their *money*. Isai. 55. 1, 2. *A condition performed, makes the thing covenanted for a due debt, which the promiser is bound to give*; so that if the Blessings of the Covenant, did depend upon conditions, they would not be of grace, but debt; and men by performing those conditions, would be, at least in part, their own Saviours. Now what can be imagined more derogatory to the Grace of God?

Object. Object. *True may some say, it would deregate from the grace of God, if we attributed such a meritoriousness unto these conditions, as the Papists do unto works; but we do not do so.*

Answ. To which I answer, (1) That the Papists assert no other works and conditions to be necessary to Justification and Salvation, then what our Adversaries do. (2) Neither Papists nor Arminians do ascribe any more meritoriousness to works, then our opponents: They grant there is such an infinite distance and disproportion between the Blessing promised, and the conditions required of us, that in strictness of Justice they do not deserve it, only *expatto*, seeing God is pleased to promise so largely upon condition of so small a pittance of service, we may be said to merit by performing the condition; and in this sence, Mr. *Baxter* [r] will tell you, That the performers of a condition, may be said to merit the reward. The Papists never pleaded for merit upon any other account; Mr. *Calvin* [s] observed long ago, how much they please themselves with this simple shift, supposing that hereby they shall evade whatsoever Arguments are brought against them: Though Mr. *B.* seems to mince the matter, calling his conditions but a *sine qua non*, and a *Pepper corn* [t], *&c.* he attributes as much, if not more to works, then the Papists, Arminians, and Socinians, have done; the Papists will not say, That works do merit in a strict and proper sence. *Smalcius* [u] calls their *fides formata*, a meer *sine qua non*; and a known friend to the Remonstrants Doctrine amongst our selves [w], dubs it with no better name, then *a sleighe, unconsiderable, despicable Pepper corn, most pitifully unproportionable, to the great rent which God might require, and to the infinite treasure of glory he makes over to us*: And again, *That mite of Obedience, Faith and Love.* But now Mr. *B.* goes a step beyond them, in that he ascribes a meritoriousness to works, which the Arminians, and Socinians have not dared to do. (3) I would ask whether the condition required of *Adam*, were meritorious of eternal life? I presume no man will say it was, in a strict and proper sense, there being no proportion between the work and the wages; but yet that condition did lessen the freeness of Divine Grace: The Grace of God was not manifested so much in saving man in that way, as in giving life unto him freely. And therefore to put our Justification and Salvation upon the same terms, must

[r] Aphor. Thes. 26.

[s] *Qui belle se absurda omisse evasisse putarunt, cum dicerent, non intrinseca sua bonitate valere opera, ad salutem consequendam, sed expatiatione.* Calv. Inst. l. 3. c. 17. sect. 3.

[t] Aphor. Thes. 23. p. 127.

[u] Apud. Stegman. in Photin.

[w] Dr. *Hamm.* 9 Ser. p 140.

must necessarily eclipse the Grace of God in the New Covenant.

Objects. *But some may say there is a great difference, the conditions required of Adam were legal conditions; but the conditions which we stand for, and assert in the New Covenant, are Evangelical Conditions.* I answer, That the sound of words doth not hing at all alter the nature of things; all conditions performed for life, are legal conditions: The precepts both of Law and Gospel, have the same matter, though not the same end; but when Gospel duties are made conditions of Justification and Salvation, there is no difference. Objects. Answ.

Object. *Yea, may some say, Evangelical conditions are more facile and easie, than the Legal were.* Are they so? Let them consider again, whether it be more easie for a man that is dead in trespasses and sins, to believe in Christ, to love God, to hate sin, to mortifie his lusts, &c. then it was for *Adam* in his innocency (when he had a natural inclination to obey God) to abstain from the fruit of one Tree, when he had a thousand besides, as good as that; there can be no condition imagined more facile and feasable, then *Adams* was. But if it were so, yet would the reward be debt, and not grace: As he that hath his peny by contract, hath as much right to it, though he laboured but an hour, as if he had endured the heat of the whole day. We say, *Gratia non variat speciem*, it is not more grace, but all grace, that doth denominate the Covenant, a Covenant of Grace. Object. Answ.

§. 9. To these Reasons there might be added many more; which because they have been mentioned before, upon another occasion, I shall not stand upon them.

4. Because all the pretended conditions of the Covenant, are promised in the Covenant: Now it is absurd to make any thing a cause of it self, or a means and condition whereby it is procured.

5. Because the asserting of conditions in the Covenant, attributes unto men a power and ability to do good, not onely before they are justified, but before they believe: For if all the promises of the Covenant are conditional, then the promise of Faith is conditional, and consequently a man must be supposed able to perform some good and acceptable work to God before he believes, whereas without Faith, *it is impossible to please God, Heb.* 11. 6. Conditions in a proper sense, do necessarily infer the liberty of mans will

unto,

unto that which is good; for as the Remonstrants do define it, *A condition is a free act which we absolutely may perform, or not perform, by Freewil not acted, by the predeterminating grace of God.* A Conditional Covenant and Freewil, are inseparable; the former supposeth the latter: Whether Mr. *W.* will own the Consequence, I am not able to say; however, that there is no such power, or ability in the Natural man to do that which is good, might be irrefragably demonstrated from sundry Scriptures, as *Gen.*6. 5. *Eph.*2. 1,2. 1 *Cor.*2. 14. 2 *Cor.*3. 5. *Rom.*7. 18. *Phil.*2. 13. *&c.*

6. Because if the Covenant were conditional, no man in this life, could attain to any assurance of his own interest in the blessings of it, but must live always in a wavering and uncertain estate, as to the hope of eternal life; that hope of Salvation which is built upon conditional promises, is (as *Calvin* observes) always wavering and tottering; for conditional promises belong to none, but unto them who have performed the condition: If remission of sins were promised unto us, not absolutely, but conditionally, as upon condition that we do believe, repent, and persevere. *Tum* (says *Rutherford*[x]) *remissa nulla omnino peccata sunt in hac vita, &c. i. e. Then it must follow that no mans sins are remitted in this life, no man is justified here, which is contrary to many plain Scriptures*, as *Rom.* 4. 10. *&* 5. 1. *&* 8. 30. *Ephes.* 1. 7. 1 *Cor.*6. 11.

[x] Exerc. Apol. p. 36. & 34

§. 10. 7. Because the Scripture shews, that there is the same proportion, between *Adams* conveying sin to his seed, and Christs conveying Righteousness to his Seed, *Rom.*5. 16. The imputation of *Adams* sin did not depend upon the personal sinful acts of his posterity, so neither doth the imputation of Christs Righteousness depend upon the good works and actions of Gods Elect; but as by *Adams* sin, all his posterity became actually sinners, even they that *had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression, i. e.* Actually in their own persons; even so by Christs Righteousness all the Elect to the end of the world, are constituted righteous, before they have performed any works, or conditions in their own persons.

8. Because if the Covenant were conditional, then Infants and Ideots, though elected, could have no interest in any of the blessings

ſings therein promiſed, in regard they cannot perform the conditions, upon which they do depend; and conſequently, dying without Faith, they muſt needs be damned.

§. 11. 9. and laſtly, If they to whom the Covenant belongs, had a right and title to all the bleſſings of the Covenant, before their believing, and turning unto God, then are there no conditions required on our part to intitle us to the bleſſings of it. But they to whom the Covenant belongs, *viz.* the Elect, had a right and intereſt in all the bleſſings of the Covenant before their believing, *&c. Ergo.* The Aſſumption ſhall be proved in our Anſwer to that Argument which Mr. *W.* hath retorted upon us from *Jer.* 31. wherewith we ſhall enter the liſts in the next place.

CHAP. XX.

Wherein Mr. Woodbridges *chief Argument againſt the Abſoluteneſs of the New Covenant, is anſwered; and this Poſition* [That God is the God of his people, before they do believe and repent] *reſtued from his contradictions.*

FRom the Scriptures before mentioned, wherein the tenor of the Covenant is recited, Mr. *W.* hath advanced this Argument againſt us, *If God be not the God of any, nor they his people before they believe, then none are in Covenant with God before they believe; but God is not the God of any before they believe.* Ergo. *As for the Propoſition* (ſays he) *he is deſtitute of ſenſe that ſhall deny it*; I ſay ſo too, if that clauſe of *Gods being the God of any*, be taken comprehenſively, and in its full latitude, for their having intereſt in God, and in all the bleſſings which God hath intended to his people; but if it be taken for the actual enjoyment and poſſeſſion of any one, or more, of thoſe bleſſings (as ſometimes it is) he is as much deſtitute of ſenſe that ſhall affirm it; for then the ſenſe of it, is this, If none do know, or have the comfort of this priviledge, *that God is their God* before they believe, then

none are in Covenant with God before they believe; this consequence is false; for there is a wide difference between having an interest in God, and the blessings of his Grace; and our knowledge thereof, or our enjoyment of those blessings. Interest and Possession, are not equipollent and reciprocal; God may promise some one benefit, in order to our possession, and enjoyment of others, though not to give us a right and interest in them. We say, that by Faith we have the knowledge and comfort of that reconciliation which Christ hath made between God and us, though we cannot say, that we obtain a right and interest therein by Faith: Through Faith we come to know, that God is our God, though our believing doth not make him to be our God. But the Assumption, *viz. That God is not the God of any before they believe*, is obvious unto just Exception, which he hath endeavored to prove after this manner; *If God promise to give Faith, that we may be his people, and he our God, then till that Faith be given, he is not our God, nor we his people: But God promiseth to give Faith, that he may be our God, and we his people, Jer.*31. 33. *Heb.*8. 10. *Ezek.*11. 19, 20. & 36. 25, &c. & 37. 23, 24, 26, 27. We have shewn before, that the Scriptures mentioned do utterly refuse to protect the *Minor*; and that all the particular promises contained in them, are parts or effects of the Covenant, and not means to bring us into Covenant. The having of a new heart doth not make God to be our God; but because he is our God, he gives us that blessing, and all things else.

§. 2. That *God is the God of his people before they do believe, and are converted*, is evident unto me from these grounds.

First, If God be their God, whom he doth peculiarly love, and whom he hath chosen, and separated to himself from the rest of mankinde, then is the Lord a God unto some before they believe; the consequence is clear, because God hath loved and chosen some in that manner from everlasting, *Jer.*31. 3. *Eph.*1. 4. Now this was not an ordinary common love, such as he bears unto all Creatures, but a peculiar distinguishing love, whereby he willed to them the greatest good, even that πνῦ ἀγάπαν mentioned *Eph.*2. 4. See *John* 17. 23, 24. But God is their God whom he doth peculiarly love, and hath chosen and separated to himself, *Ergo*. For what is it to have the Lord for our God, but to be appropriated

to God, to have such an interest in God, as others have not, to be the objects of his speciall love? It was *Israels* prerogative above all the Nations of the world, that they had *the Lord to be their God*; now the Lord became their God, *by setting his love upon them*, and *chusing them to be a peculiar people to himself*, Deut. 7. 6, 7, 8. and by *separating them from other people*, Lev. 20. 24, 25. The Lord, *Ezek.* 16. 8. declares concerning spiritual *Israel*, *that they became his*, whilst they were in *their blood*, that ere ever they were washed and adorned (had any amiable qualities in them) *he swear unto them, and entred into Covenant with them*; which swearing as it refers to spiritual *Israel*, must be understood of that Oath which he made to Christ, concerning the blessing of his seed. The Prophet infers this their relation unto God from *his everlasting love*, Jer. 31. 3. The Apostle likewise *Rom.* 8. 31. grounds the Saints interest in God, or their having God to be with them, upon his eternall and unchangeable good will towards them, even before he spared his Son to dye for them. So 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. *The foundation of God standeth sure; the Lord knoweth them that are his*; Implying, that the election, and fore-knowledge of God doth make men his.

§. 3. Secondly, If the Lord be a God, not onely to his people, but to their seed also, then is he a God to some before they beleeve; But he is a God not onely to his people, who are called, and doe beleeve, but to their seed who are not called, and do not yet beleeve, *Ergo*. The Lord promised *Abraham*, that he would be, not only his God, but the God of his seed; the seed of *Abraham* did not then beleeve, yet the Lord stiles himself their God. And the Apostle tels those converts *Act.* 2. 39. *That the Promise was to them, and to their children*: Now what was that Promise, but *Ero Deus tuus & seminis tui*? If our opposers say, That God was not the God of their children, untill they were called, they will be guilty of the same Tautology which they charge upon the *Anti-pedo-baptists*; upon this ground it is, that the children of beleeving Parents are admitted to baptisme, before they beleeve; because God hath declared, that hee is their God.

§. 4. Thirdly, They whom the Lord hath purchased to be a peculiar people to himselfe, have the Lord to be their God; But God

hath purchased some to be a peculiar people to himself before they beleeve, *Ergo.* The *major* is evident, for when a man makes a Purchase, he obtains a legall right and propriety in the thing purchased; *Quod venditur transit in possessionem ementis.* And therefore the Apostle concludes from hence, *that we are not our own but Gods*, because, *we are bought with a price*, 1 *Cor.* 6. 19,20. The *minor* is undeniable. That God did purchase us before we do beleeve, even when he gave himselfe ἀντίλυτρον, *a Ransome for us*, 2 *Tim.*2.6. *he bought us* (saith the Apostle) *with his precious blood*, 1 *Pet.*1.18,19. thereby we were made λαὸν περιούσιον, *a peculiar people*, *Tit.*2.14. Though he had not immediately upon the payment of the price, the possession of us, yet thereby he obtained a right to us; we became his in right, though not in injoyment; It was here, as with a man that buyes a Living, and payes down the price, he hath immediately a right to it, though he hath not the present possession of it; he may call it his own, though it be not in his hands.

§.5. Fourthly, If we recive all good things from God; yea, Faith it selfe, upon this account, because we are his people, then God is our God before wee beleeve; But wee receive all good things from God, even Faith it selfe, meerly upon this account, because we are his people, as *Gal* 4.6 *Because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son, into your hearts.* They were Sons before they received the Spirit of his Son. So *Isa.*48.17. *I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, scil.* By my word and works; by which means men are brought to Faith and Repentance: No reason can be given why one man profits by the Word, and another doth not, but because the Lord is a God to one, and not to the other; he hath chosen one, and not the other, *Act* 13.48. *as many as were ordained unto eternall life*, i.e. chosen and separated from the rest of mankind, to be a peculiar people unto God, *beleeved.*

§.6. Fifthly, If none can or do Beleeve and Repent, but they to whom the Lord doth manifest this Grace, That he is their God, then the Lord is our God before we beleeve and repent; But none do or can beleeve and repent, but they to whom God doth reveale and manifest this Grace; *Ergo. We chuse him, because hee hath chosen us; and love him, because he hath loved us first*, Joh.15.

Joh.15.16. 1 Joh.4.10.19. In *Hos.*2.23. saith the Lord; *I will have mercy upon her, that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not my people, thou art my people, and they shall say, Thou art my God.* I have observed that Expositors generally, doe take notice of the order of the words. As Mr. *Burroughs* [a], *God must begin with us, we cannot begin and say,* Thou art my God; *but God must begin with us first, and say,* You are my people. And Dr. *Reves* [b], *Hic ordo est considerandus, &c. The order of the words ought diligently to be observed; It is God that begins and calls them his people: who being made his people through Grace, doe by Faith give their consent, and own him for their God.* And *Zanchy* [c] to the same purpose, The order of the words shewes, *That God doth first prevent us with his Grace, and makes us his people, then follows the assent of our Faith, whereby we acknowledge and imbrace him for our God.* So that our Faith, doth not make him to be our God, but suppose he is so.

a *Bur.* on Hos. 1 Vol. p. 674.

b In loc. obs. 6. p. 101.

c Tom. 5. in Hos. p. 57.

§.7. Sixthly, They to whom God is a Father, and a Shepherd, have the Lord for their God. But God was our Father, and Shepherd before we believed, *Ergo.* All the Elect are the *Sheep*, and *Children* of Jesus Christ. They are his *Sheep*, *Joh.* 10.15. *I lay down my life for my Sheep*, he laid down his life, not onely for them that were then called, but for them that were to be called afterwards, so *ver.*16. *Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold*; The Elect Gentiles were his sheep, before they were brought into his Fold, *scil.* the visible communion of Saints. They are also called his *Seed and Children*, *Isa.*53.10. and *Heb.*2.13. *Behold I, and the children which God hath given mee:* Hee speaks of all *those Sons, whom he was to bring unto Glory, ver.*10. So *Jer.*3.19. *Thou shalt call me, my Father*; Their calling him Father, did not make, but suppose him to be their Father, and in this respect he is called an *Everlasting Father*, *Isa.*9.6.

§.8. Mr. *W.* tels us, *That he hath onely one observation to adde, which the most learned among the Jewish, and Christian writers, doe often take notice of, and that is this,* [*That God is never said to be our God in reference to his giving of the first Grace, but onely in reference to the blessing, which he promiseth to them that have Faith*] Heb.11.16. *He is not our God,*

that he may give us Faith, but is every where said to give us Faith, that he may be our God, 1 *Pet.* 2. 10. I acknowledge that Mr. *W.* is a learned man, yet I know it is much above his reach to determine, who are the *most learned* amongst the Jewish, and Christian Writers; who as yet hath not looked into the tenth part of either: As for the Jewish Doctors, I suppose no man will think them competent Judges of Gospel verities; and I must confesse, that too many of our Christian Writers are leavened over-much with a Jewish legal spirit; However if he had pointed to the Authors that make this Observation, I should have weighed the grounds whereon they lay it; the names of men, though never so learned, weigh lighter then a feather in matters of Faith. If he took up his Observation upon trust from *Grotius* (as I suspect he did) I shall presume once more, to advise him to take heed of tampering with the Notions of that learned Apostate.

§. 9. I have shewed already that sundry Godly and Learned men are of another mind, who exclude all manner of Conditions from the New Covenant, and consequently do make Faith a part of the Covenant, and not the means to bring us into Covenant; to which there might be added many more, as *Lubbertus*[d]. *The Promises of the Law are conditionall, promising life, not freely, but to such as fulfill the Law, and therefore they leave mens Consciences in doubt, for no man fulfilleth the Law; But the Promises of the New Testament have no such Condition joyned unto them, nor require any thing of us, nor depend upon any Condition of our worthinesse, that bring, and give unto us freely, Forgivenesse of sins, Grace, Righteousnesse, and Life everlasting for Christs sake &c. Melancton* speaks as fully to the purpose[e]. *Men commonly* (saies he) *doe imagine that the Gospell is a conditionall Promise; but this conceit is to be rooted out of them. — The Gospell offers remission of sins and Eternal Life, without the Condition of our works.* And again[f], *Our Obedience is neither the Cause, nor the Condition, for which wee are accepted before God.* So P. *Martyr*[g], *Wee deny* (saies he) *That the Covenant of God concerning the remission of sinnes hath any Condition annexed unto it.* And *Olevian*[h], *The whole frame, or substance of the New Covenant, is without any Condition.*

Estius

[d] In Gal 4.25. fol.218.

[e] Melanct in Rom. 3. *Vulgo imaginantur homines evangelium esse promissionem conditionalem, at ab hac imaginatione, adducendi sunt, &c.*

[f] Ib. in Rom. 4.

[g] *Nos negamus Testamentum Dei de remissione peccatorum, habere adjunctam conditionem* loc com. de Justif. fid. sect 65 p. 387.

[h] *Tota substantia fœderis est sine conditione,* De N. fœd. sect. 11

Estius puts this question i, *How the New Testament can be called a Covenant, seeing it contains only a meer free promise, whereas Covenants do consist of conditions on both parts? We may (says he) answer (says he) that good works are the condition thereof, seeing that works themselves are contained in the promise of the New Testament: But* (says he) *the word* [Benith] *doth not onely signifie a Covenant in a strict sense, which consists of mutual conditions, but a single promise which is free from all conditions; and such a Covenant is that which we call the New Testament*, viz. *Promissio Dei prorsus absoluta & gratuita*; to wit, *that promise of God which is altogether free and absolute*. With him agrees Dr. *Amesk*, who addes, *That the New Covenant is more properly called a Testament, then a Covenant; because a Will or Testament bequeaths Legacies, without any office or condition of the Legatees*. And *Beza*l, *The word* Diathekè *used Gal. 3. 14. doth not signifie* (says he) *any promise, but that which is altogether free, in which respect it is opposed to the Law; for the promises of the Law have conditions annexed to them; and therefore the word* Diathèkè *whereby the New Covenant is signified, is better rendred Promise, then Covenant*. But to avoide prolixity, I shall desire the Reader at his leisure to peruse *Junius* his Second Oration *De fœdere novo*, prefixt to his Enarrations on the four first *Psalms*, who being so great a Linguist and Lawyer, his Judgement in this point, ought the more to be regarded. If may be Mr. *B.* and Mr. *W.* will place them but in the form of *ignorant* and *unstudied Divines*; Though they do, it hath been sufficiently confirmed, with the authority of a greater Doctor. And if *we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater*, 1 *John* 5. 9.

i Comment. in Heb. 8. 10.

k Coronis 3d Col. Hag Edit. 6. p. 4co.

l Beza in Gal. 3. 14.

§. 10. The Scriptures which Mr. *W.* hath brought, do no whit help him, as *Heb.* 11. 16. where it is said, *God was not ashamed to be called the God of* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob, who were believers; *Ergo*, (says he) *God is not the God of any, before they do believe*: He might reason as well, a Father acknowledgeth and stands by his son, when he is in distress, *Ergo*, He was not his father before. The scope of the place, is not to shew when God did become their Father, but rather the faithfulness and condescendence

[m] See *Dickſons Com.*

ſcendence of God towards his people in their low eſtate [m], for though they were pilgrims and ſtrangers in the world, hated, and deſpiſed of all, yet God did own, and honor them. See *Pſal.* 105.12,13,14,15. So that, in 1 *Pet.* 2, 10. (where the Apoſtle ſpeaking to the Saints, ſays, *In times paſt, you were not a people, but are now the people of God,*) is to be underſtood, in reference to the external adminiſtration of the Covenant, and not the real participation, or intereſt in the bleſſings of it: Indeed, in the firſt conſideration, none are the people of God, but they that do profeſs the fear and worſhip of the true God, *who walk in the name, i.e.* In the Laws and Ordinances of God. In which reſpect the Elect before Faith, are ſaid *to have been without God in the world,* *Eph.*2.12. And in this ſenſe, all that do profeſs the truth, are *the people of God,* though many of them are Hypocrites; who are therefore ſaid to be of *Iſrael,* though they are not *Iſrael*; and ſome that are but fruitleſs branches, are notwithſtanding ſaid to be *in Chriſt*; which muſt be underſtood in reſpect of external profeſſion, and not of internal implantation. But in the later conſideration, none are the people of God, but they that do belong to the Election of Grace, who are the Spiritual Seed, and *Iſrael* in truth: And thus, all the Elect, whether called or uncalled, are the people of God; though before converſion, they have not the comfort, yet they have a good right and title unto all the purchaſes of Chriſts death. God knows them to be his people, though they know not, that he is their God.

Micah 4.5.

Rom. 9.6. Joh.15.2.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Wherein the remaining Arguments which Mr. Woodbridge *hath brought to prove, That the New Covenant is not an absolute Promise, and that the Elect have no right to the Covenant before they believe, are answered.*

MR. *W.* towards the close of his Book, hath cast in three, or four Arguments more, for the confirmation of his Opinion, which he thinks superfluous. *I might* (saith he) *spare the pains of further proof.* And truly, I think so too, unless he had bestowed his pains in a better cause: I must tell him, That when he hath said all that he can, in defence of this cause, he will at last sit down a looser; for *when the day shall come, which shall try every mans work, of what sort it is; this hay and stubble* of mans righteousness, and mens pleadings for it, *shall be consumed to ashes*; though I am perswaded better things of him, and such as do accompany Salvation; In the mean time, I shall gladly hear the utmost that he hath to say, in the defence of his Opinion.

§. 2. His first Argument, of this last rank, is grounded upon those words, *Isa.* 55. 3. *Come unto me,* (that is, *Believe in me, John* 6. 35.) *and I will make an Everlasting Covenant with you.* Ergo, *The New Covenant is not an absolute promise, and none have any interest in the Covenant, before they believe.* To which, I answer (1) the Particle [*Vau*] may be taken Illatively, (as in some other places it is) thus [*For*] *I will make an Everlasting Covenant*; so that the Covenant is the ground of our coming, and not *è contra*: Or (2) if we take it Copulatively, as our Translators do, no prejudice can come thence, unto our Assertion; for, *I will make an Everlasting Covenant.* is all one, as if he had said, *I will perform, or give to you, all other benefits promised in my Everlasting Covenant, even the sure mercies of David,* as the Apostle expounds it, *Acts* 13. 34. Those pro-

miſes which are propoſed conditionally by the Prophets, are rendred abſolutely by the Apoſtles; as for inſtance, that of the Prophet, *Iſa.* 59 20. *The Redeemer ſhall come to* Zion, *and unto them that turn from tranſgreſſion in* Jacob. The Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. 26, renders it, *There ſhall come out of* Zion *the Deliverer, and ſhall turn away ungodlineſs from* Jacob; implying that Faith and Repentance, are parts of the Covenant, which God will give unto them, for whom Chriſt hath procured them.

§. 3. His ſecond Argument is, *That the voice of the Goſpel, which is the Covenant of Grace, is every where* [Believe in the Lord Jeſus, and thou ſhalt be ſaved] *in oppoſition to the Covenant of Works, which ſaith,* [do this and live.] Ergo, *before believing, none have intereſt in the Covenant.* We grant, that this precept or exhortation, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus,* is frequently found in the New Teſtament, but that this doth formally contain the tenor of the Goſpel, or New Covenant, we have before diſproved. The Goſpel properly and ſtrictly taken, conſiſts neither in the precepts, nor promiſes of the New Teſtament, but in the declaration of theſe glad tidings, that the promiſes which God made unto his people in the Old Teſtament are now fulfilled [a]; to wit, the promiſes concerning the coming of the Meſſiah, and the clear exhibition of all the fruits and effects of his Mediatorſhip. So that the ſum of the Goſpel is rather comprized in this [b], *That Jeſus Chriſt is come into the world to ſave ſinners, yea, the cheif of ſinners. That by his one offering, he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified.* Now they that are ſent forth to publiſh and declare theſe glad tidings, are to invite and command all men every where to believe in him whom God hath ſent; aſſuring them in the Name of God, That all that do believe in him, ſhall not periſh, but have everlaſting life: The command of believing, with the promiſe of life to Believers, are parts of our Miniſtery, they are not the tenor of the Goſpel, or New Covenant. The Covenant whereof Chriſt is the Mediator, is ſaid to be better then the former, becauſe it doth conſiſt of better promiſes, *Heb.* 8. 6. Now what thoſe better promiſes are, he tells them immediately out of *Jeremy, I will put my Laws into their hearts, &c.* wherein the Lord promiſeth all good things unto them, without the leaſt reſtipulation from them. It is ſaid indeed, *they that are called, i. e.* do believe,

[a] Acts 13. 32, 33. Luke 1. 54, 55, 69, 70. Acts 26. 22, 23. Luke 4. 18, 21.
[b] 1 Tim 1. 15. Heb. 10. 14.

believe, *shall receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.* It doth not follow, that their calling unto Faith, was the condition whereby they obtained the inheritance; no more, then because it is said, *Chap. 5. 9. Christ is the Author of Salvation to them that do obey him. Ergo.* Works and Obedience are conditions on our part to obtain Salvation: Which places do describe the persons that are saved, but not the tearms or means by which they do obtain Salvation; they that are called *do receive, i. e.* Enter into the *promised inheritance*; he doth not say, that by vertue of their calling, they do enter, or were invested with a right and title thereunto; the repeating of his Consequence, is answer enough: They that are called, shall receive the eternal inheritance; *Ergo*, None have any interest, in the Covenant before believing, or the New Covenant is not an absolute promise.

§. 4. His next Argument is to this effect, *The Covenant of Grace is to be preached to every man; but the absolute promise is not made to every man.* Ergo, *The Covenant of Grace is not an absolute promise. Answer*, The Argument is faulty, both in Matter and Form; the Assumption should be, But the absolute promise (*scil.* of Mercy and Forgiveness, without Works and Conditions performed by us) is not to be preached to all men, which is false. But we will take things as they lie before us. *The Covenant of Grace is preached to every man, and every man called upon to fulfil the conditions of it, that he may receive the blessings of it, which condition is Faith, Heb. 4. 1, 2.* Here is a grain of Corn, in a heap of chaff: It is true, that the Gospel, or Covenant of Grace, ought to be preached unto every Creature, *Mark 16. 15. Matth. 28. 19.* But it is not true, that the Preaching of the Gospel is to call upon men to fulfil the conditions of the Covenant, or that Faith is the condition of it: The place alledged sayes no such thing, the words are an Exhortation to sincerity and perseverance in our Christian Profession, by a similitude taken from foolish Racers, who by giving over before they come to the Goal, do lose the Crown. We also have a race to run, there is a Crown set before us, and therefore we ought to take heed, least by any means we fall short thereof; though no man shall enter into the Heavenly *Canaan* without Faith, yet it follows not, that Faith is the condition whereby we

get an interest either in that, or the other blessings of the Covenant. The Absoluteness of the New Covenant is no ways inconsistent with the Preaching of the Gospel unto every Creature: For what is it to Preach the Gospel? But (1) to publish these joyful tidings, That the Son of God is come into the world to save men from their sins; that in the Sacrifice which he hath offered, there is plenteous Redemption for the cheif of sinners. (2) To press and exhort all men without exception to believe in him. 1. With the assent of their mindes, that all things which are written of him, cheifly concerning the merit of his sufferings, and the efficacy of his death, are true and infallible. 2. With the imbraces of their hearts, to wit, With such affections as are suitable to so great a good; and more particularly to trust, relie, and roul themselves upon him, for all the purchases of his death; and in so doing, confidently to expect the fruition of them in the fittest times. Now the Absoluteness of the New Covenant is so far from being any impediment to Faith, as that it affords men the greatest encouragement to believe, both to cast themselves into the arms of Christ, and to put on a strong confidence of inheriting all the promises, seeing that in their accomplishment, they depend not upon Works and Conditions performed by themselves.

§. 5. Mr. *W.* demands, (1) *Whether there be an absolute promise made to every man, that God will give him grace?* Though there be not, yet are the general promises of the Covenant, a sufficient ground for our Faith, for as much as Grace therein, is promised indefinitely to sinners; which all that are ordained to life, shall believe, and lay hold of? *But*, says Mr. *W.* *is it sense to exhort men to take hold of Gods Covenant, or to enter into Covenant with God, if the Covenant be onely an absolute promise on Gods part? &c.* What contradiction is there unto sense in either of these? For 1. what is it to lay hold of the Covenant, but (as *Benhadads* Servants did by *Ahabs* words, 1 *Kings* 20.33.) to take up those gracious discoveries which God in his Covenant hath made of himself to sinners, and to resolve with the woman of *Canaan*, not to be beaten off with any discouragements? Which act of Faith is called *The taking of the Kingdom of Heaven by violence*, *Matth.* 11. 12. Which is, when a

Exod. 34. 6, 7.

soul

Soule appropriates generall Promisee to himselfe in particular*, *And against Hope, believes in Hope.* The Apostle calls it, *Fleeing for refuge to lay hold on the Promise, Heb. 6. 18.* which Promise, is the same which God confirmed by an Oath, Vers. 17. Now wee doe not finde that God did ever confirme any Conditionall Promise with an Oath, but onely those Absolute Promises of his Grace *, *Isai. 54. 9, 10. Psal. 89 34, 35.* As for the other phrase of *entering into Covenant with God*, Though wee never find it in the New Testament, that the Apostles did exhort men to enter into, or to make a Covenant with God, yet I conceive that it may bee used in reference to the External Administration of the New Covenant; Men may bee said to enter into Covenant with God, when they take upon them the profession of Christianity, and give up themselves to bee the Lords People. In this respect wee may exhort men, as the Apostle doth, *To give up themselves a living Sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God,* and to abide stedfast in the Covenant of God; or rather, as the Apostles phrase is, *To hold fast their Profession firme unto the end, Hebr. 3. 6.* It were absurd to exhort men either to make, or to concurre to the making of the Covenant of Grace, which is his act alone, *who sheweth mercy unto whom he will.*

a ἀντέχεσθαι τῆς ἐλπίδος, Christ.

* See Reyn: on Psal. 110. p. 385

§. 6. His next Interogative is a very strange one, he asks us, *Whether if the Covenant be an absolute Promise, it be sense, to accuse, blame and damne men for unbeleefe, and refusing of the Gospell? Was it ever known that men should be counted worthy of death, for not being the objects of an absolute Promise?* By his favor, who did ever say, that men are damned for not being objects of an Absolute Promise? We say, the condemnation of Reprobates doth inevitably follow, upon their not being included in that Covenant, which God hath made with Christ, or Gods not giving them unto Jesus Christ; but this is, *antecessio ordinis, non causalitatis*; their exclusion from this Covenant, is but an Antecedent, and not the cause of their destruction. Men are damned for not beleeving that Grace which God hath manifested to sinners, for not receiving it with that esteem, and such affections as it doth deserve; so that formally, the cause of their damnation, is not

their non-being objects of Gods absolute Promise, but their disobedience to the Command of God. If he say (as the Remonstrators have done before him [b]) That they are unjustly blamed and damned for unbeleefe, seeing they have no Object for their Faith, no Christ to beleeve in; We shall Answer, That there is a reall Object proposed to their Faith, though there be no such absolute Promise that God will give Grace to every man in particular; the Object of Faith is the Written Word, and more especially the Free Promises of Mercy unto wretched sinners, for the sake of Christ, which all men are commanded to beleeve, both *assensu intellectus, & amplexu voluntatis*, and for their unbeleefe they perish everlastingly. If he shall ask, Why God doth command them to beleeve in Christ, seeing he never intended they should have any good or benefit by Christ? I must say with the Apostle, *Rom.9 20. O man, who art thou that disputest against God?* We ought to look to his Commands, and not curiously to search into his Councels, *Deut.22:29.* We know that the Preaching of the Gospell was ordained principally for gathering Gods Elect; now because Ministers know not who are Elected, and who are not, It was necessary that the offer of Grace, and command of Beleeving should be universall, which will be imbraced and obeyed by all that are ordained to life.

[b] *Credere jubet fidei nullum objectum ponit.*

§ 7. His fourth and last Argument against the absoluteneſſe of the New Covenant, is, *If the Covenant of Grace be an absolute Promise, then no men in the world, but wicked and ungodly men, are in Covenant with God.* To which I Answer, (1) It is very true, That the Covenant of Grace is made with Christ in behalfe of sinners, and none else, *Matthew 9. 13. The whole need not a Phisitian but the sick.* If men were not sinners, and ungodly, there would be no need at all of the Covenant of Grace, the Covenant of Works would have been sufficient; either it is made with sinners or none. (2) It will not follow, that when men are in Covenant, or doe partake of some blessings of the Covenant, that immediately the Covenant ceaseth; when we are in Glory, the Covenant shall not cease, for the continuance of Glory is promised in the Covenant, no lesse then Glory it selfe, for which cause it is called an Everlasting Covenant. So that his inference is very irrationall, *If the Covenant be an absolute Promise,*

miſe, then none but wicked, i. e. unregenerate *perſons are perfectly in Covenant with God*; It followes rather from his owne opinion, for if the Covenant be a conditional Promiſe, when the condition is performed, *the Covenant is ſo far forth fulfilled*, and the Performers of it, *ſo far forth doe ceaſe to be in Covenant*; *and ſo* conſequently, *none but wicked men*, i. e. ſuch as have not yet fulfilled the Condition, ſhall be the objects of the Covenant, or the perſons to whom it doth belong. Or elſe it muſt follow, that none at all are perfectly in Covenant with God; the Performers of the Condition are not, becauſe the Condition being performed, the Covenant is fulfilled, and thereby ceaſeth to be a Covenant; and the non-performers of the Condition are not, for till the Condition be performed, men have no right or intereſt in the bleſſings promiſed. By this Sophiſtry a man may ſoon diſpute himſelfe out of the Covenant, and conſequently out of hope.

§. 8. I have now (through the aſſiſtance of a good God, and the advantage of a good Cauſe) followed Mr. *W.* to the end of his race. Hee ſeems weary of his walke as well as I. *It is* (ſaies he) *beyond my purpoſe, and worke, to follow this purſuit any further*, i. e. I have no more to ſay; for I dare ſay, if he could have thought upon any thing elſe, either to colour his own, or to vilifie the cauſe which he doth oppoſe, he would not have held it in; his laſt Argument ſufficiently ſhews, he hath pumped to the bottom. I muſt confeſſe I am as glad as he, that I am arrived ſo near to my journeys end; though the paſſage hath not been very difficult, yet I muſt needs ſay, it hath been to me ſomewhat (more perhaps then ordinary) troubleſome, in regard I have ſo little time and ſtrength to beſtow upon theſe paper conflicts. And therefore though my adverſary (who, I know, wants neither words, nor confidence) ſhall offer a Reply, I ſhall not ingage to make a Rejoynder: Having declared my judgement, with the Reaſons of it, I ſhall ſubmit my ſelfe to the cenſure of the godly Reader; beſeeching the Father of Lights, to lead both him, and me into all truth, and more eſpecially into a fuller manifeſtation of our Free Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt.

§. 9. But before I can take my leave of the Reader, I muſt requeſt

queſt his patience, whilſt I take notice of a paſſage or two, in Mr. *Woodbridges* concluſion to his *Worthy Sir*,

First, He tels him [*though it is likely, ſomething is, or will be ſaid* againſt my Sermon (*which at this diſtance I am never like to hear of,*) *yet ſure I am, that nothing can be anſwered conſiſtent with the truth of Scripture.*] Concerning his Sermon, I have ſaid no more in his abſence, then I was ready to have ſpoken unto his face, had the time, and the patience (I had almoſt ſaid the paſſions of ſome of his friends) given me leave; I confeſſe I had not made my Replies ſo publick, had he not offered ſuch open wrongs both unto the Truth and to my ſelfe. His *Bravado* [ſure I am, that nothing can be anſwered, &c.] argues rather his conceit of himſelfe, then the ſoundneſſe of the Doctrine which he would maintain; A bold face is uſually the laſt refuge of a bad cauſe, which the Advocate puts on to uphold his credit amongſt the ſimple, who are apt to thinke that hee hath the ſtrongeſt Argument, who ſhewes the greateſt confidence [c]. I remember *Campian* the Jeſuite, in his Epiſtle to the Univerſities tels them, *he was as ſure he had gotten the victory, as that there is a God, a Heaven, a Faith, a Chriſt.* I ſhall not anſwer Mr. *W.* as Dr. *Whitaker* doth the Jeſuite, *Pudet vanitatis jactationis arrogantiæ tuæ modes promittere, &c.* But I muſt needs ſay that he talks at too high arate, and not as a man ſenſible, in how many things wee offend all; doth he know as much as all men beſides? Or can he judge of mens Anſwers before he hath heard them? Had *Parker*, *Twiſſe*, *Pemble*, *&c.* nothing at all to ſay in defence of their Doctrine? Doth he think this Sermon ſuch a ſolid peece, that all men living will be ſtruck dumb therewith? Though I am not conſcious of deviating a ſillable from the ſence of the Scripture in this Diſcourſe, yet I dare not ſay, *That nothing can be anſwered unto what I have written*; I ſhall ſay of my writings, as the Apoſtle of himſelfe, 1 *Cor.* 4. 3. *I know nothing in them inconſiſtent with the Scriptures, yet are they not hereby juſtified*: All that I deſire is, that the Reader would bring them to the Standard of Truth, and hold faſt that which they ſhall finde agreeable thereunto. This I am as ſure of as Faith can make mee (whoſe certainty is greater then that of Science) that the whole glory of our Juſtification and Salvation ought to bee given to the Grace of God.

[c] *Ingenium bominis metiuntur ex audacia, & dextram putant fronti geminam.* Kend. Ep. ad Ac. Oxon.

God, and the Merits of Christ; which would not be done, if either of them did depend, and were obtained by Works and Conditions performed by us.

§. 10. Next he tells him, *How sorry he is, for the breaches that are amongst us.* Truly, if he be not, I think he may, having contributed, not a little, to the widening of them: for before his Sermon, we were upon the Matter agreed, concerning the point which is now in difference; we had oftentimes Friendly and Christian communion; which ever since hath been interrupted. It was not a moneth before, that I had Conference privately with my Reverend Neighbor (my first Antagonist) about this thing, who told me, *That he held the New Covenant to be Conditional, no otherwise, then in respect of Gods order, and method, in bestowing the blessings of it.* To whom I replyed, That if he asserted Conditions in the Covenant, in no other sense, we were agreed: And he knows, that in the Letters which had passed between us, I had yeelded as much, to wit, That in improper speech, the Covenant may be called Conditional; though for the causes before mentioned, I use not the phrase. And therefore, if any new breach hath hapned about this matter, the guilt of it must rest on others, and not on me. For my own part, I am not conscious in my self of the least breach in Affection with any of my Neighbors; being ready to serve them in love, as opportunity is offered; though some of them have used me spitefully, refusing (as of old the *Jews* did towards the *Samaritans*) to have any dealings with me, so much, as in Civil Affairs. I confess, I have forborne some of their Lectures, because I would not, by my silence, give Testimony to that which I know to be heterodox and unsound: And I thought good a while to desist from making open Exceptions, until I had given a more publick account of my practise in this particular: For the future, I shall not put my self to the trouble of writing more Books, unless it be to answer the Exceptions of my Reverend Neighbor (who first engaged me in this Controversie) either against my Doctrine or Practise: But if in any Congregation of this City (where a charge of Souls is incumbent on me) I am present, when these Fundamental Truths of the Gospel, are darkned and undermined by strangers, or others, I shall (God willing) put on the Apostles

reſolution, (though the weakeſt and unworthieſt of my Brethren) *Not to give place to them by ſubjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth and ſimplicity of the Goſpel may continue amongſt us*; and yet with due reſpect unto all mens perſons: Let any man do the like by me, I ſhall not account it a breach of peace. If Mr. *W.* had any intent to heal our breaches, I muſt needs ſay, he was very unhappy in the choice of Means. No prudent man will judge it a probable way to compoſe differences, to uſe calumniating and opprobrious Language towards them that diſſent; or to lay unto their charge, ſuch things as they abhor. But to Mr. *Woodbridges* Prayer for Peace, in the cloſe of his Diſcourſe, I ſhall adde mine, both for him, and my ſelf, *That we may do nothing againſt the truth, but for the truth.*

Matth. 11. 19.

Wiſdom is juſtified of her Children.

FINIS.

The Printers Poſtſcript.

SInce theſe Sheets were wrought off at the Preſs, the Author had neither health, nor leiſure to Revize them; I hope there are no ſuch Errata, *as can diſturb the Rational Reader, thoſe that are, if thy Judgement doth Correct them, and thy Charity cover them, thou ſhalt much oblige both the Author, and me, to ſerve thee in all Chriſtian Offices.*

R. I.